New Series *Volume VIII, Number 31* *August 1957*

The Review of English Studies

A Quarterly Journal of English Literature and the English Language

Editors
PETER ALEXANDER
NORMAN DAVIS

Assistant Editor
JEAN ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

The Quartos and the Folio Text of *Richard III*. By Andrew S. Cairncross 225

Two New Holographs of Pope's Birthday Lines to Martha Blount. By R. M. Schmitz 234

Johnson's Poetic Imagination. By Susie I. Tucker and Henry Gifford 241

Interpretation of *The Ancient Mariner*. By J. W. R. Purser . 249

The Last Enchantments. By A. E. Dyson 257

NOTES

Ridiculosae Sternutationes (Joy Russell-Smith) 266

The Musical Studies of a Fifteenth-Century Wool Merchant (Alison Hanham) 270

Sir John Hayward and Tacitus (Edwin B. Benjamin) . . . 275

(*Continued at foot of next page*)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. Bennett; John Butt; R. W. Chapman; H. B. Charlton; Una M. Ellis-Fermor; Sir Ifor Evans; Sir Walter Greg; Sir Herbert Grierson; Edith J. Morley; Allardyce Nicoll; A. W. Reed; Percy Simpson; Kenneth Sisam; D. Nichol Smith; James R. Sutherland; Alice Walker; Dorothy Whitelock; F. P. Wilson; J. Dover Wilson; C. L. Wrenn.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.

Language and Literature of the Anglo-Saxon Nations as presented in German Doctoral Dissertations, 1885–1950. A Bibliography, by Richard Mummendey, 277; Devotional Pieces in Verse and Prose, edited by J. A. W. Bennett, 278; Bibliography of Medieval Drama, by Carl J. Stratman, 279; The Unity of the Canterbury Tales, by Ralph Baldwin, 281; The Court of Venus, edited by Russell A. Fraser, 282; Malone Society Collections III. A Calendar of Dramatic Records in the Books of the Livery Companies of London 1485–1640, 283; Leicester Patron of Letters, by Eleanor Rosenberg, 285; The Roanoke Voyages 1584–1590, edited by D. B. Quinn, 287; The Poor Man's Comfort, by Robert Daborne; July and Julian; and Dick of Devonshire (Malone Society), 289; The Life and Death of King Richard the Second, edited by Matthew W. Black (New Variorum Shakespeare), 290; On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists, by Fredson Bowers, 293; New Readings in Shakespeare, by C. J. Sisson, 298; Shakespeares Dramatische Konzeption, by Richard Laqueur, 301; The Mutual Flame. On Shakespeare's *Sonnets* and *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, by G. Wilson Knight, 302; Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution, by William Haller, 305; The Levellers. A History of the Writings of Three Seventeenth-Century Social Democrats: John Lilburne, Richard Overton, William Walwyn, by Joseph Frank, 307; An Anatomy of Milton's Verse, by W. B. C. Watkins, 309; Personification in Eighteenth-Century English Poetry, by Chester F. Chapin, 310; The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift. Volume XII. Irish Tracts 1728–1733, edited by Herbert Davis, 311; *The Englishman*. A Political Journal by Richard Steele, edited by Rae Blanchard, 315; Pope's

[*Continued on p. iii of cover*

SHAKESPEARE QUARTO FACSIMILES

Edited by SIR WALTER GREG

Henry V (1600)

This is the first volume in the series to appear since the Clarendon Press took over publication from the Shakespeare Association and Messrs. Sidgwick and Jackson. It contains twenty-seven pages of photo-lithographic facsimiles. 25*s.* net

Shakespeare in the Theatre, 1701–1800

A record of performances in London 1751–1800

CHARLES BEECHER HOGAN

This completes the work of which the first volume, containing a record of performances in London from 1701–1750, appeared in 1952 (price 48*s.* net). 70*s.* net

Mastery and Mercy

A study of two religious poems: *The Wreck of the Deutschland* by G. M. HOPKINS, and *Ash Wednesday* by T. S. ELIOT

PHILIP M. MARTIN

Both poets write out of a deeply felt Christian experience and their poems deserve attention, even meditation, by Christians who may not be students of literature. Canon Martin's intelligent and sympathetic exposition will greatly help the ordinary reader. 15*s.* net

The Descent into the Cave

and other Poems

JAMES KIRKUP

The title of Mr. Kirkup's new volume is taken from the record of his experiences on an expedition into the Mendip caves. 'It is his extraordinary accuracy of impression, coupled with ingenuity of imagery and integrity of thought, that makes his pieces so oddly memorable.' *Liverpool Daily Post.* 12*s.* 6*d.* net

THE OXFORD HISTORY OF ENGLISH ART

Volume IV

English Art, 1216–1307

PETER BRIEGER

The development of the arts during this period is divided into three stages: the first shows English Gothic reaching its finest achievement; the second, the growth of a courtly style; the third is a transition phase with patronage spreading from the court to gentry and merchants, and the introduction of new features in art. Illustrated. 50*s.* net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

On the Poetry of Keats

E. C. PETTET

'A thoroughly sound book, well written and persuasive, generously illustrated by quotation, and well supported by footnotes, often embodying the points of view of other critics.' THE TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT. 35*s. net*

The Sermons of John Donne, III

EDITED BY

G. R. POTTER & E. M. SIMPSON

An authoritative and complete edition of Donne's sermons in ten volumes. Volumes I, II, VI, VII and VIII have already been published. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS. 56*s.* 6*d. net*

The Poet's Craft

A. F. SCOTT

Material for a course in the critical appreciation of poetry. The book includes 25 facsimiles of manuscript poems, and sections on printed versions, sources, translations, and 120 poems arranged for comparison. 18*s. net*

Shakespeare Survey, 10

EDITED BY ALLARDYCE NICOLL

Shakespeare's Roman plays form the main theme of this year's *Survey*. There are the usual reviews of the year's productions and contributions to Shakespeare studies. 8 *plates.* 21*s. net*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE QUARTOS AND THE FOLIO TEXT OF *RICHARD III*

By ANDREW S. CAIRNCROSS

IN a recent article on the 'doubtful' quarto of *King Lear*, I suggested that the Folio text of that play was set up by its *one* compositor, B, from the *two* quartos (Q1 and Q2), corrected from an authentic manuscript, and used alternately as copy.[1] I now propose to examine the other 'doubtful' quarto—*Richard III*—and to argue that the F text, set up by the *two* compositors, A and B, was printed from *three* of the six quartos then available—Q1, Q3, and Q6—used in some sort of rotation, and corrected with varying degrees of accuracy from an authentic manuscript. The implication, as in the case of *Lear*, is that the procedure arose, not from Heminge and Condell in the theatre (as usually supposed), but in the printing-house for the convenience of the compositors and the editor-corrector there.

This runs counter, of course, to the current theory, which is still based on Daniel's general assumption[2] that only one quarto was used when a play was set up from print. The quarto Daniel advocated for *Richard III* was Q6; and, as in *Lear*, he was forced to set aside or explain away some very cogent evidence for another quarto, Q3.[3] On Daniel's theory, F agreements with Q6 against Q1 can be explained as the result of failure to correct the Q6 copy in accordance with the manuscript; while F agreements with Q1 against Q6 are assumed to be due to the restoration, from the manuscript, of the true readings which the later quartos had corrupted progressively in the reprinting.

An alternative trend of editors, however, still on the one-quarto-copy theory, has been to postulate a Q3 basis for at least the two long passages—III. i. 1–164 and v. iii. 48 ff.—in which Q and F are practically identical;[4] and recently J. K. Walton has argued that F was printed throughout from a copy of Q3 corrected with reference to manuscript.[5] But since Patrick's study[6] it has been generally agreed that some use was indeed made of Q3,

[1] *R.E.S.*, N.S. vi (1955), 252–8.
[2] Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, *Lear*, *Q1* (1885), p. v.
[3] This view was also held by Chambers (*William Shakespeare*, i. 299), who ignored Q3.
[4] See, for example, Spedding, *Trans. N.S.S.* (1875–6), 1–75; Alex. Schmidt, *Jahrbuch*, xv (1880), 301–24; Cambridge Shakespeare (1891–3), v. 17–18.
[5] *The Copy for the Folio Text of 'Richard III'* (Auckland, 1955).
[6] *Richard III* (Stanford, 1936).

though indirectly and to supplement Q6 as the main copy. The one-quarto assumption is now maintained by supposing that the playhouse manuscript was defective in some way for the two long passages concerned—III. i. 1–164 (or 167) and V. iii. 48 to the end—and that the defects had been made good with leaves of Q3; so that one physical copy was still sent to the printer. Thereafter, as Greg explains, 'Presumably the manuscript was old and worn and was being destroyed in preparing the copy for the folio: the printed leaves it contained were abstracted and substituted in the copy [Q6] in order to save transcribing the few prompter's notes they bore.'[1] Since the manuscript, at these two points, was naturally wanting, no correction of the print was possible, and the Q3 pages became the copy for F.

Now there is little doubt, as the collations given below will demonstrate, that the F text owes something to Q3 *and* Q6. This is generally agreed, and, I think, will hold. But Walton's recent attack on the use of Q6, and an independent investigation of the theory, show that there is something radically wrong with its present form. The evidence is worth considering in detail.

Of the later quartos ('Q1 being out of the question', says Daniel, p. xi), Q6 shows the largest number of exclusive agreements with F; Daniel gives twelve, and Dr. Alice Walker[2] mentions thirteen. Omitting for the moment one of Daniel's, which occurs in what is now called the Q3 stretch at V. iii. 250[3] (Qq12 foile; Qq 3–5 soile; Q6F soyle); and one at IV. i. 82 (Qq 1–5 my; Q6F mine), which may be due to chance, editing, or the influence of line 81; and adding other possible cases, we have something like the full list of readings peculiar to Q6 and F:

I. iv. 13	Qq 1–5	thence	Q6F	there	1
22		waters		water	
24		wracks		wrackes	
236		thinke of		thinke on	2
237		lessond		lessoned	
273		heauens		heauen	
IV. iv. 112		wearie		wearied	3
208		vale		vaile (=veil)	
238		or		and	
509		you		ye	4
534		Dorshire		Dorsetshire	
536		tidings		newes	

[1] *Editorial Problem* (3rd edn. Oxford, 1955), p. 87.
[2] *Textual Problems of the First Folio* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 14.
[3] References as in the Cambridge edition (1892).

and possibly, though the first is ambiguous:

III. v. 66	Qq 1–5	cause	ease Q6; case F	
74		meetst aduantage	meetest aduantage Q6 meetest vantage F	5

The total indebtedness, reckoned on these exclusive agreements, of F to Q6 is seen to be confined to five short passages, two of them of not more than a dozen lines. This is a remarkable distribution for what is supposed to have been uniform copy. Why, one is forced to ask, are the collator's lapses so unevenly spread? How is this carelessness to be reconciled with the meticulous correction he is supposed to have shown throughout the rest of the Q6 sector?[1] It is not that these passages have been entirely overlooked and uncorrected; corrected readings are interspersed with uncorrected.[2] It is rather that the work is careless, and this is quite at variance with the supposed meticulousness. It suggests that there is something inherently contradictory in the theory of Q6 copy.

The phenomenon persists when the inquiry is extended to the Q6 variants which are not exclusive but originated in Qq 2–5, and could, of course, have got into F by way of Q6. Of these there are about eighteen; five in I. i. 65–124, on signature A3;[3] three or four at I. ii. 226–I. iii. 22;[4] one (I. iv. 247) within group 2 above (a normal correction of number, however);[5] one at III. v. 20 (innocence Q1; innocencie Qq 2–6F); three, possibly attached to group 5, in one quarto page at III. v. 108–III. vii 20;[6] two within 53 lines at IV. ii. 82–IV. iii. 5;[7] one at IV. v. 7, at the end of group 4.[8] There is also an isolated example at II. iv. 1 that may be accidental.[9]

The shape of the Q6F agreements, the apparent alternation of careless correction with meticulousness, suggests that we are dealing, not with the vagaries of an individual corrector, but with alternate types of copy. The meticulousness may be nothing more than use of Q1 copy, and Q1F agreements not corrections but adoption of uncorrected or partly corrected Q1 copy. The agreements of F with Q6 would thus be attributable to the intermittent use of Q6 copy; the absence of Q6F agreements being due, naturally, to the use of Q1 copy.

Corroboration for this idea comes from the occurrence of Q1F errors,

[1] Walker, op. cit., p. 22; and collation of I. i. 1–124 below, p. 229.
[2] See below, pp. 230, 231. [3] See below, p. 229. [4] See below, p. 230.
[5] Qq 1–5 Makes peace; Q6F Make peace.
[6] III. v. 108 maner of person Qq 1256: maner person Qq 34F; III. vi. 12 whose (whoes) Qq12: who Qq 3–6F; III. vii. 20 mine Qq12: my Qq 3–6; to an end Qq124: to end Qq356; toward end F.
[7] IV. ii. 82 is it Qq126: it is Qq 3–5F; IV. iii. 5 ruthles Qq12: ruthfull Qq 3–6F.
[8] Harford (Herford) Qq125: Hertford Qq346.
[9] heare Qq12: heard Qq 3–6F.

though indirectly and to supplement Q6 as the main copy. The one-quarto assumption is now maintained by supposing that the playhouse manuscript was defective in some way for the two long passages concerned—III. i. 1–164 (or 167) and V. iii. 48 to the end—and that the defects had been made good with leaves of Q3; so that one physical copy was still sent to the printer. Thereafter, as Greg explains, 'Presumably the manuscript was old and worn and was being destroyed in preparing the copy for the folio: the printed leaves it contained were abstracted and substituted in the copy [Q6] in order to save transcribing the few prompter's notes they bore.'[1] Since the manuscript, at these two points, was naturally wanting, no correction of the print was possible, and the Q3 pages became the copy for F.

Now there is little doubt, as the collations given below will demonstrate, that the F text owes something to Q3 *and* Q6. This is generally agreed, and, I think, will hold. But Walton's recent attack on the use of Q6, and an independent investigation of the theory, show that there is something radically wrong with its present form. The evidence is worth considering in detail.

Of the later quartos ('Q1 being out of the question', says Daniel, p. xi), Q6 shows the largest number of exclusive agreements with F; Daniel gives twelve, and Dr. Alice Walker[2] mentions thirteen. Omitting for the moment one of Daniel's, which occurs in what is now called the Q3 stretch at V. iii. 250[3] (Qq12 foile; Qq 3–5 soile; Q6F soyle); and one at IV. i. 82 (Qq 1–5 my; Q6F mine), which may be due to chance, editing, or the influence of line 81; and adding other possible cases, we have something like the full list of readings peculiar to Q6 and F:

I. iv. 13	Qq 1–5	thence	Q6F	there	1
22		waters		water	
24		wracks		wrackes	
236		thinke of		thinke on	2
237		lessond		lessoned	
273		heauens		heauen	
IV. iv. 112		wearie		wearied	3
208		vale		vaile (=veil)	
238		or		and	
509		you		ye	4
534		Dorshire		Dorsetshire	
536		tidings		newes	

[1] *Editorial Problem* (3rd edn. Oxford, 1955), p. 87.
[2] *Textual Problems of the First Folio* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 14.
[3] References as in the Cambridge edition (1892).

and possibly, though the first is ambiguous:

III. v. 66	Qq 1–5	cause	ease Q6; case F
74		meetst aduantage	meetest aduantage Q6 meetest vantage F

The total indebtedness, reckoned on these exclusive agreements, of F to Q6 is seen to be confined to five short passages, two of them of not more than a dozen lines. This is a remarkable distribution for what is supposed to have been uniform copy. Why, one is forced to ask, are the collator's lapses so unevenly spread? How is this carelessness to be reconciled with the meticulous correction he is supposed to have shown throughout the rest of the Q6 sector?[1] It is not that these passages have been entirely overlooked and uncorrected; corrected readings are interspersed with uncorrected.[2] It is rather that the work is careless, and this is quite at variance with the supposed meticulousness. It suggests that there is something inherently contradictory in the theory of Q6 copy.

The phenomenon persists when the inquiry is extended to the Q6 variants which are not exclusive but originated in Qq 2–5, and could, of course, have got into F by way of Q6. Of these there are about eighteen; five in I. i. 65–124, on signature A3;[3] three or four at I. ii. 226–I. iii. 22;[4] one (I. iv. 247) within group 2 above (a normal correction of number, however);[5] one at III. v. 20 (innocence Q1; innocencie Qq 2–6F); three, possibly attached to group 5, in one quarto page at III. v. 108–III. vii 20;[6] two within 53 lines at IV. ii. 82–IV. iii. 5;[7] one at IV. v. 7, at the end of group 4.[8] There is also an isolated example at II. iv. 1 that may be accidental.[9]

The shape of the Q6F agreements, the apparent alternation of careless correction with meticulousness, suggests that we are dealing, not with the vagaries of an individual corrector, but with alternate types of copy. The meticulousness may be nothing more than use of Q1 copy, and Q1F agreements not corrections but adoption of uncorrected or partly corrected Q1 copy. The agreements of F with Q6 would thus be attributable to the intermittent use of Q6 copy; the absence of Q6F agreements being due, naturally, to the use of Q1 copy.

Corroboration for this idea comes from the occurrence of Q1F errors,

[1] Walker, op. cit., p. 22; and collation of I. i. 1–124 below, p. 229.
[2] See below, pp. 230, 231. [3] See below, p. 229. [4] See below, p. 230.
[5] Qq 1–5 Makes peace; Q6F Make peace.
[6] III. v. 108 maner of person Qq 1256: maner person Qq 34F; III. vi. 12 whose (whoes) Qq12: who Qq 3–6F; III. vii. 20 mine Qq12: my Qq 3–6; to an end Qq124: to end Qq356; toward end F.
[7] IV. ii. 82 is it Qq126: it is Qq 3–5F; IV. iii. 5 ruthles Qq12: ruthfull Qq 3–6F.
[8] Harford (Herford) Qq125: Hertford Qq346.
[9] heare Qq12: heard Qq 3–6F.

and Q1F mechanical variations from all the other quartos. The outstanding error of this kind—'hopst' (F hop'st) at IV. iv. 45, where Qq 2–6 read, correctly, 'holp'st'—has hitherto passed for a coincidence, or common error due to similar pronunciation; or has had to be explained, with some improbability, as an error in the manuscript, conscientiously but ignorantly restored by the corrector. Q1F agreements in defective and erroneous punctuation are numerous, and have not attracted the attention they deserve. They may be picked up almost at random, e.g.:

I. ii.	119	Q1F	Is not . . .	
			As blamefull as the executioner.	Qq 2–6 ?
	144		Why dost thou spitte at me.	?
	199		But shall I liue in hope.	?
I. iii.	98		What may she not she may . . .	3–6 not?
IV. v.	8		What men of name resort to him.	3–6 ?

So with speech-prefixes:

I. iii.	151	Q1F *Qu.*	Qq 3–5 *Q. M.* Q6 *Qu. Mar.* Camb. *Q. Eliz.*
	309	Qq1–5 *Qu.*	Q6 *Hast.* F *Mar.* *Q. Eliz.*
IV. i.	90	Q1F *Dor.* (*Dors.*)	Qq 2–6 *Qu.* (proved wrong by line 91).[1]

Even the introduction of Q1 into the Q6 sector, however, is not the end of the matter. Q3 as well as Q1 may also have to be brought into the Q6 sector. There are at least two significant Q3F agreements here:

III. v.	108	Q34F maner	Q1256 maner of	
IV. iv.	423	Q3F I burie	Qq12 I buried	Qq 4–6 Ile burie

And even the recognized Q3 sectors are not secure; each shows at least one considerable F variation from Q3 in favour of Q1:

III. i.	29	Q1F	Haue come Qq 3–6 Come
V. iii.	221	Q1F	Ease-dropper (Q1 ease dropper) Q2 ewse dropper Q3 ewse-dropper Q4 eawse-dropper Qq56 dropper

It is, I think, inconceivable that all these agreements between Q1 (and Q3) and F against Q6 and between Q1 and F against Q3 should occur on the present theory of copy for F. They would have either to be set down to pure coincidence, or to be explained by some common manuscript origin, that is, some bibliographical link between a manuscript assembled memorially by the players (Q), and the authentic playhouse manuscript (F)—bibliographical links which would further have to be maintained contrary to the quarto copy used. Neither supposition will suffice. It is

[1] Noted by J. Dover Wilson, *Richard III* (Cambridge, 1954), p. 148.

abundantly clear that the extent and allocation of the Q copy must be re-examined; and that Q1, Q3, and Q6 must all be considered as possible sources of copy for F throughout.

On the theory now suggested—the use of three of the quartos—an examination of the first four pages of Q in their relation to F is illuminating, showing as it does the alternate use of Q1 and Q6:

A2	I. i.	1	Q1F	our	Q6	*omits*
		8		measures		pleasures
		10		in stead (steed)		instead
		14		shapte (shap'd) for		sharpe of
		21		scarse		*omits*
		48		Godfathers		good fathers
		51		whats (what's)		what is
		52		I know		I doe know
A3		65	Q6	tempts . . . *omits*	Q1	tempers
			F	tempts . . . harsh		
		71	Q6	is . . . secur'd		is . . . is securde
			F	is . . . secure		
		92	Q6F	strooke		stroke
		101–2		*2 lines*		*omits*
		124		this		the

The line of separation here is quite clear-cut. In A2, F agrees with Q1 against Qq 2–6 even to minute details (except that 'inductious' is altered to 'inductions'); and at least five substantial alterations (loue/lute; spy/see; shall/should; for/but; Haue/Hath) have been made, either from manuscript or on the initiative of the corrector. On a theory of Q6 copy, he must have corrected most meticulously here. He must even have gone the length of restoring (?) 'what's' for 'what is', 'in stead' for 'instead', and 'dayes' for 'daies' (42) unless this was a compositorial spelling. The second of these restorations is quite pointless, and probably incorrect. It is obvious, in fact, that he was here reproducing forms he found in Q1. In A3, on the other hand, where F could not have been printed from Q1—since it retains Q6 erroneous variants—there is hardly a sign of correction from manuscript, and no agreement with Q1 against Q6. And there are two obvious botches, confirming absence of correction, either from Q1 or from manuscript:

I.	i.	65	Q1	That tempers him to this extremity,
			Q6	That tempts him to this extreamitie:
			F	That tempts him to this harsh Extremity.
		71	Q1	By heauen I thinke there is no man is securde
			Q6	„ „ „ „ „ ∧ secur'd
			F	„ „ „ „ „ ∧ secure

In the first, F has perpetuated the Qq 2–6 error 'tempts' and tried to restore the metre by inserting 'harsh'. In the second, F has followed Qq 4–6 (rightly or wrongly) in the omission of the second 'is', and tried to improve the sense by altering 'secur'd' to 'secure'. The failure to do anything about the corruption apparent in lines 97–105 is another proof that authentic correction is not a strong feature of this Q leaf as it appears in F.

The most significant thing about this contrast is that the dividing line coincides with the end of the *Q1* page (A2^{v}) at line 64, and not with the end of the Q6 signature at line 70.

It will now be simplest to take Q1 as the normal copy for F in the so-called Q6 sector, and to indicate departures from Q1, i.e. those passages where Q3 or Q6 was in fact used; then to examine afresh the two long 'Q3' passages; and finally to deal with any other evidence that may affect the general conclusion.

The second non-Q1 passage—I. ii. 225–I. iii. 22—proves to be from Q3, not Q6, and covers signature B3. The collation is:

I. ii.	225	F	omits a half-line, at the change-over from Q1 copy.						
	226	Q1	No,	Q3	No:	Q6	No:	F	No:
	230		What I		What I?		What I		What? I
	235		at all		withall		withall		withall
	251		to a		to a		to be a		to a
I. iii.	5		*omits*		with		with		with
	14		Is it		Is it		It is		Is it
	17		come the Lords		comes the Lords		comes the Lords		comes the Lord

It is clear that the common factor here is Q3, and that even F departures from all the quartos are based on the Q3 readings, as at I. iii. 17. The passage contains, also, three Q1F agreements—I. ii. 231 hate (Qq 2–5 heate); I. ii. 257 adorn (Qq 3–6 adore); I. ii. 259 some (Qq 3–6 a)—which might be corrections from manuscript, though the first two might easily be conjectural. The passage begins, it is worth noting, at the top of the Q6 page B3^{r} and the return to Q1 copy is made at the top of the Q1 page B4 (I. iii. 22).

The third non-Q1 passage runs from the top of B4^{v} (in Q1) at I. iv. 13, as far as 27, where F inserts a line. F makes a certain number of corrections or changes, but overlooks, and adopts, several readings peculiar to Q6, or Qq 2–6, as well as the brackets (not in Q1) in line 19 (Q6F agreements in italics):

		Qq 1–5	Q6	F
I. iv.	13	thence	*there*	*there*
	14	fearefull	fearefull	heauy
	16	pact (Q1)	past	pac'd
	18	stumbling	stumbling	falling

19	Stroke (Qq 1–4) that . . . him	*Strooke* (*that . . . him*)	*Strooke* (*that . . . him*)
21	Lord, Lord	Lord, Lord	O Lord
22	waters	*water*	*water*
22, 23	my (Q1)	*mine*	*mine*
23	vgly sights of	vgly sights of	sights of vgly
24	Me thought wracks	Me thought *wrackes*	Me thoughts *wrackes*
25	Ten	Ten	A

Some of the Q6F agreements are, of course, stronger than others; and some could be due to coincidence, or the spelling habits of the compositors. When they are taken together, however, the trend is not in doubt, nor is the mixture of F corrections from manuscript with retention of Q6 variants. Before and after this passage, F is clearly derived from Q1 or Q3.

The remaining Q3/Q6 stints are, approximately:

4. Q3 I. iii. 329–53 (?)
5. Q6 I. iv. 234–47
6. Q3/Q6 III. iv. 107–III. v. 21
7. Q6 III. v. 74–94
8. Q3 III. v. 95–III. vi. 14
9. Q3? IV. ii. 78–IV. iii. 5 (F omits IV. ii. 103–20)
10. Q6 IV. iv. 111–28
11. Q6 IV. iv. 199–241 (F omits 221–34)
12. Q3/Q6 IV. iv. 264–87 (F omits 288–342)
13. Q6 IV. iv. 357–410
14. Q3 IV. iv. 411–32
15. Q6 IV. iv. 433–IV. v. 7/16 (passage transposed in F).

These ascriptions, and their limits, are sometimes doubtful. It is not always certain whether an occasional Q1F agreement means a correction in the Q3 or Q6 copy or the use of Q1 copy. And sometimes there is too little variation among the quartos to fix precisely the limits of use of a particular quarto. But the general situation is clear, and the evidence sufficient and unequivocal.

In addition to this adjustment in the 'Q6' sector, another has to be made in each of the 'Q3' stints. (*a*) The first has been supposed to begin with Act III. The collation of the first 38 or 39 lines, however, is not only compatible with Q1 copy, but in favour of it; in other words, *Q1* copy, used throughout Act II, probably continues into Act III.

			Q1	Q3	Q6	F
III. i.	1	S. D.	Glocester	Glocester	Gloster	Glocester
	8		Hath	Hath	Haue	Hath
	29		haue come	come	come	haue come

33	to	the	to	to
38	the	to	the	the
40	in heauen	*omits*	*omits*	*omits*

The presence of Q3 copy is quite clear from line 40 onwards to line 164 (or 167); and it is Q3 entirely uncorrected in the text. Lines 1–38, however, would require meticulous correction, even to the spelling, of variants in which there is no obvious error, on a theory of Q3 copy. Assume Q1 copy, and consistency is restored. And, since Q1 copy was in use for the whole of Act II, the continuation into Act III is quite natural. It may be noted, further, that the Q speech-prefix *Glo.*, which is replaced everywhere else in F by an abbreviation of *Richard*, begins after line 40 (at 63) and ends at 154; the previous examples (lines 2, 7, 17) following the usual F form *Rich.* (*b*) It may well be that there is also a short passage of *Q1* copy in the second 'Q3' passage (v. iii. 48 onwards). At v. iii. 202 there begins a series of Q1F agreements:

v. iii.	204	Q1F	had	Qq36	*omit*
	205		murtherd (F. . .'d)		murthred
	217		stroke		strooke
	221		ease dropper (Q1)		ewse-dropper (Q3)
			Ease-dropper (F)		ewese-dropper (Q6)

The copy for *Richard III*, then, seems to have consisted mainly of Q1 and Q3, supplemented by Q6. Each of the three quartos, however, might be used in very short stints. Without knowing whether the compositors worked simultaneously or in what order the text was set, we can only surmise the how and why of these phenomena. It is indeed recognized that the F printers preferred printed to manuscript copy; and it may be suggested that the preparation of a complete printed text (though manuscript would be necessary to supply omissions from the Q) would enable them to return the valuable playhouse manuscript quickly to its owners. Where two compositors were likely to be available, such a copy would have the further advantage that it could be divided physically between them, as a playhouse manuscript probably would not.

It seems unlikely that the complete copy was prepared in advance of printing. This could have been done from two quartos, cut up and pasted at will, and using only one side of each leaf. That three quartos *were* used suggests either that some attempt was made to work with the complete quartos,[1] at least at the outset, and that the third, or spare, Q was meantime corrected a little in advance; or alternatively that, later at least, the corrector tore out and worked with separate leaves of all or any of the quartos. The latter view is supported by the facts that most of the departures from Q1 copy coincide with the beginning or ending of a page of

[1] Cf. the use of A2 and A3 above, p. 229.

one or other of the quartos, and with difficulty in the copy because of heavy correction or the need for restoring omitted matter, somewhere in the vicinity. The fifth passage[1] is immediately followed by the famous crux in which Clarence pleads with the murderers; no. 9 restores the 'clock' passage; there is heavy correction, insertion, and rearrangement in no. 6 and no. 14; and an insertion in no. 11, no. 12, and no. 8. The apparent inconsistency and want of a rigid plan is probably nothing more than an *ad hoc* set of arrangements to suit the particular needs and circumstances of corrector and compositors in the course of the F printing.

However that may be, the conclusion is relatively simple, so far as it goes. The current theory that Q6 (or Q3) was used as a prompt-book, or that a copy of Q6 was sent to the theatre for collation with the manuscript, is automatically ruled out by the use of *three* quartos. And since the description of Q as 'doubtful' (like *Lear*) also depends on the supposed emanation of *one* quarto from the theatre as F copy, the category becomes itself doubtful. Both quartos (*Lear* and *Richard III*) contain a memorial element, and there seems no sufficient reason not to relegate them to the 'bad' quarto class, except perhaps that they are, or rather seem, better than the other bad quartos so far recognized. It is a matter of degree, and the degree may be more apparent than real. The extent of QF corruption at, for example, I. i. 65–106 or III. i. 40–164 is difficult, if not impossible, to determine.

Heminge and Condell, then, it may be suggested, sent to the printers a manuscript containing the text of *Richard III* as they wished it to appear. Jaggard acquired, in 1622 or 1623, a copy each of Q1, Q3, and Q6. The copyright was held by Matthew Law, whose attitude was no doubt responsible for the delay in proceeding with the Folio during 1621–2, and who had taken the opportunity to issue a reprint—Q6—on his own account. The three quartos Jaggard (as likely as another) collated with the manuscript as far as he thought fit or necessary, and as best suited his own time, the availability of his compositors, the necessary correction, and the difficulty of the copy. He was thus able to return the manuscript sooner, and to supply his compositors with separate printed copy, either in advance, or as they went along. At some points the correction was very casual or hurried; and the proof-reading done without reference to the manuscript. Heminge and Condell are thus unlikely to have had any hand in F beyond supplying the manuscript; and no one is likely to be responsible for the general F corruption but the staff of the printing-house.

Finally, the text, so far as it rests on Q1, is now open to suspicion, since QF agreements are no longer a guarantee derived from two independent versions, but may conceal F failures to correct Q errors. Freedom of emendation is correspondingly enlarged; but so is editorial responsibility.

[1] See p. 231; and I. iv. 255–65.

TWO NEW HOLOGRAPHS OF POPE'S BIRTHDAY LINES TO MARTHA BLOUNT

By R. M. SCHMITZ

I

THE history of the 'very true and very warm' sentiments which Pope addressed to Martha Blount at Mapledurham on her birthday, 15 June 1723, makes one of the best chapters in the late Norman Ault's *New Light on Pope*. In that chapter Ault takes the reader step by step through an elaborate account of how a fourteen-line 'a' text became, after many and complex mutations, the twenty-line 'e' text which is now published under the title '*To Mrs.* M. B. *on her Birth-day*'. Ault adds a bibliographical appendix of 29 items: 22 printed versions, 4 contemporary transcripts, and 3 holographs.[1] The chapter is so acute and elaborate that Ault's claim to have told the story 'in its entirety' seems reasonable enough. During the past year, however, two new holographs have come to light, almost doubling the number with which Ault worked, and one of these is of particular interest because it makes a direct challenge, disputing the primacy of his 'original', the 'a' text printed by him under the title 'Written June y^e^ 15th/On Your Birth-Day./1723'.

The manuscript in question is in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York city. It is a single sheet headed 'A Wish on M^rs^ M.B.'s Birthday', written by Pope and corrected at two points in his hand. On the verso, in the hand of William Mason, we read:

> This was the original paper sent by M^r^ Pope to M^rs^ Blunt. She gave it to M^r^ Bethel, after whose death it came into M^r^ Warburton's hands, amongst some MS Letters of M^r^ Pope's to M^r^ Bethel. M^r^ Warburton gave it to me May 30^th^ 1754. W Mason

Immediately below this, in another hand, are two lines which read:

> C Alderson M^r^ Mason's Executor to the Duchess of Devonshire Jan^y^: 31^st^ 1798

These notes offer a clear line of descent from Pope to Martha Blount to Hugh Bethel to William Warburton to William Mason (d. 1797) to his friend Georgiana Cavendish, Duchess of Devonshire. Shortly after 1798

[1] Ault's extended account in *New Light on Pope* (London, 1949), pp. 195–206 and 365–6, is condensed in the editorial apparatus attached to the 'e' text in Pope's *Minor Poems*, ed. Ault and John Butt (London and New Haven, 1954), pp. 244–7.

the manuscript sheet was made into one of about 600 plates which, interspersed among the re-bound pages of Pope's *Poetical Works*, 1785, made five handsome volumes for the library of Henrietta Frances (Spenser), Lady Bessborough, younger sister of the Duchess of Devonshire. These are the volumes now in the Morgan Library: the manuscript follows p. 81 in the fourth volume.[1]

Immediately after the Pope holograph are two loose sheets, one of them a transcription of the Martha Blount lines from an autograph which had been sent to Edward, Earl of Oxford,[2] and the second reading:

> [The Earl of Oxford's lines] differ in some slight respect from mine, which were sent by him [*i.e.* Pope] to Mrs B—a[nd] probably were the original lines, in which he afterwards made alterations. . . . This copy is now in Mr Croker's possession by whom it was communicated to me.–
>
> On Monday [?] Jany 30 1849.

Both sheets seem to indicate a close connexion between the then owner of the Bessborough volumes and John Wilson Croker, whose great collection of Pope materials was the foundation for the Elwin-Courthope edition. One wonders how the Pope holograph should have escaped mention there among the 'originally thus' notes.

I have put Mason's claim in this setting because I believe that it cannot simply be dismissed as a collector's overstatement about what he has or thinks he has in his collection. Mason's name is at the very centre of a consistent history, with many parts clearly authentic and none improbable.

But still more important is the text of the Morgan sheet itself, and this text must compete with a formidable opponent, the manuscript known as Mapledurham 4. That manuscript—Ault's 'original'—carries a very personal title: *Written . . . On Your Birthday. . . .* That manuscript is signed: *A: Pope.* That manuscript was, until very recently, preserved at Mapledurham, the Blount family home. No other manuscript carries such evidence of authenticity. But authenticity and precedence are two different matters, and the text of the Morgan holograph seems to confirm Mason's claim. It reads:

> A Wish on M^rs^ M. B.'s Birthday
>
> Oh be thou blest with all that Heav'n can send,
> Long Life, long Youth, long Pleasure, and a Friend.

[1] Morgan Library Book no. 4239, Pope's *Poetical Works* (Glasgow: Foulis, 1785, 3 vols. extended to 5). The MS., 8¼ × 6¾ in., is, like all the pages of this edition, framed, and is an integral part of the volume. The first volumes of the set carry an elaborate armorial bookplate with the monogram H.F.B. [Bessborough]; for help in identifying this I am grateful to Miss Kenway of the Morgan Library.

[2] i.e. from MS. Longleat, Portland Papers, XIII, f. 11.

Not with those Toys the female world admire,
Riches that vex, and Vanities that tire.
Let Joy, (or Ease), let Affluence (or Content)
And y^e^ glad Conscience of a Life well-spent,
Calm ev'ry thought, inspirit ev'ry Grace,
Glow in thy cheek, & smile upon thy face!
Let Day improve on Day, and Year on Year,
Without a Pain, a Trouble, or a Fear.
since must
And Oh ~~when~~ Death ~~shall~~ that fair frame destroy, 11
Die, by some sudden Extacy of Joy;
In some soft dream may thy mild Soul remove,
And be thy latest Gasp a Sigh of Love.

In comparing this text with all other 'a' versions, we find that the readings of l. 3—*female world*—and of l. 8—*Glow in thy cheek*—exist only in the Morgan manuscript. Certainly the reading *cheek* is poor, and seems early. The reading *Long Life* of l. 2 appears also in the Mapledurham manuscript, but it is there cancelled and altered to *Long Health*. The corrections indicated in l. 11 appear in their corrected form in the Mapledurham manuscript. The twelfth line of the Mapledurham manuscript reads:

Die by a sudden
~~Oh be it by an~~ Extacy of Joy!

This, when compared with the same line in the Morgan manuscript would seem to argue against my assumptions, but it is not at all unreasonable to believe that the Mapledurham reading occurred to Pope while he was transcribing from the Morgan sheet. And lastly, for a point which will be made later, we might observe that the phrase *female world*, which disappeared from all other versions of the 'a' text, did not appear again until 1738, when the poem appeared in its final twenty-line 'e' text in *The Works . . . Vol. II, Part II*.

These observations, taken together and in the light of Pope's working habits, make it reasonable to believe that the Morgan manuscript was the sheet which lay before Pope when he wrote the lines sent to Mapledurham; that he kept it as a 'desk' copy to which he reverted from time to time; and that, having put it to its final use in preparing the *Works* of 1738, he presented it to Martha Blount. He might even have told her that it was the 'original paper'. By this time the sheet would be for her only a second copy which she could give away without a qualm. The 'original' to her would be the sheet which Pope sent on 15 June 1723, and that one she kept.

II

The lines to Martha were Pope's sentiments addressed to the woman of his deepest affections on her thirty-third birthday. 'If', as Professor Sherburn writes, 'Pope's "carcase" had not been so crazy and insignificant and if Martha Blount had not been so tall and stately', Pope and 'Patty' Blount might have been man and wife by this time.[1] Within a month after sending the lines off to Mapledurham, Pope found another use for them, this time for a poetical flirtation with a young and very impressionable girl. She was Judith Cowper, who at the age of eighteen was a devotee of poetry and Pope, in imitation and admiration of whom she composed 'Abelard to Eloisa', lines 'To Mr. Pope—Written in his Works', and an ambitious 'Progress of Poetry'. By the time she was twenty some of her verses had been shown to Pope, who indited an ode to her as 'the mild Erinna blushing in her Bays'. By this time also she was corresponding with Pope, who replied to her letters in the role of poet-gallant.[2]

The lines to Martha Blount reappeared in this correspondence when, on 13 July 1723, Pope sent Judith a three-page letter of which the birthday poem—now entitled 'To a Lady on her Birthday. 1723.'—was the central feature, prefaced and followed by elegant sentiments on friendship and happiness. He begs Judith to 'alter [the poem] to y^{r} own Wish' and asks her to make a copy of it for 'Mrs. H*** . . . to y^{e} End She may value it'. It is the manuscript of this letter that has now come to light through the efforts of Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., as collector, and of George Sherburn as editor of Pope's *Correspondence*.[3]

The manuscript permits us to date this version of the poem from the smudged but decipherable postmark 13/JY, and it permits us to guess that the partly deleted *H**** for whom the transcript was to be made was Mary *Howe* rather than Henrietta *Howard* as the name has previously been reconstructed.[4] So far as the poem itself is concerned, the manuscript will change none of the essentials, but the story of the text and of the girl deserve more consideration than Norman Ault gave them, working chiefly from the *Letters of the late Alexander Pope, Esq. To a Lady* as they were printed in 1769.

The text of the birthday lines sent to Judith may very well have been a

[1] George Sherburn, *The Early Career of Alexander Pope* (Oxford, 1934), p. 291.

[2] This account of Judith is heavily dependent upon Falconer Madan, *The Madan Family and Maddens in Ireland and England* (Oxford, 1933), which contains a section entitled 'Judith and Pope', also an extended account of her as a poetess, and an ample selection of her verses. She was the daughter of Spencer Cowper of Cole Green near Hertford. The poet William Cowper (b. 1731) was her nephew.

[3] The manuscript, in Mr. Houghton's collection, is on a folded sheet of Pope's correspondence paper with leaves 8¾ × 7 in. The poem takes up the lower half of the second page and the upper half of the third.

[4] The new identification is fully elucidated in Mr. Sherburn's edition of Pope's *Correspondence*, ii. 179–80.

second version drawn from the 'desk' copy, with which it corresponds exactly at two crucial points. At three other distinctive points it corresponds with the Mapledurham manuscript, and at one point with neither. The opening words of the second line—*Long Life*—appear in the Morgan manuscript and in the Mapledurham manuscript (as a cancelled reading), but disappear from the two subsequent autographs of the 'a' text. The distinctive readings do make it perfectly clear, however, that the three manuscripts are closely associated.

But the personality of Judith enters like a comic vice in the old plays to confuse the record. Judith was a poetess. The cardinal event of her twentieth year was the correspondence with her adored Pope, whom she had not met, but who wrote so charmingly: 'Your writings are very good and very entertaining' . . . 'I long for your return to town' . . . 'I Pass whole days sitting before your picture'. Surely the birthday greetings were written for her alone, or at least with her foremost in his mind. That conclusion is supported by a manuscript in the British Museum containing, among the Cowper family papers, a transcript of the poem entitled: 'On M^rs J-d-th C-p-r's Birth Day—By M^r Pope'.[1] But Pope had other thoughts when the matter came to his attention, and he wrote quite bluntly to John Caryll that a 'simpleton of [Martha's] sex pretended they were addressed to herself'.[2] Besides, if he had intended the lines for Judith's birthday, he had missed the date by forty-three days. Her birthday was 26 August.

Pope did not perhaps know that his gallantry to Judith had gone one step farther, and that she, reading such phrases as 'desire you to alter' and 'see this mended in your Copy', did indeed—'blushing in her Bays'—*alter* and *mend* the poem. We find, at least, that the Cowper transcript has changed the phrase 'those Toys the Woman World admire' to 'those Joys that Womankind admire', and that the climactic word of the eleventh line is changed from *Fear* to *Tear*, a more feminine closing for the series, 'Without a Pain, a Trouble, or a Fear'.[3] Judith was apparently pleased with the whole affair. When she came to write verses on her own birthday, she closed them with the couplet:

> Yet to this Merit may the Wretch pretend,
> That *Howe* and *Pope* vouchsafe to call her Friend.[4]

And it was probably through a transcript by Judith that the Spalding Gentlemen's Society on 30 November 1723 enjoyed the secretary's reading of a poem 'by M^r Pope on M^rs Cowper's Birthday. M.S.'[5]

[1] B.M. Add. 28101.
[2] *Letters*, ed. Elwin-Courthope, i. 303.
[3] The manuscript is clear, so that capital T's, F's, and J's can be exactly distinguished.
[4] *The Madan Family*, p. 100.
[5] The MS. Minutes, kindly transcribed by the Hon. Secretary, Mr. G. W. Bailey.

III

The account of autographs, transcripts, and two printed versions of the 'a' text may now be summed up in a simple chronological table, to be followed by a few brief comments. The texts appear now to be:

1. The Pierpont Morgan Library MS. The 'desk' copy.
2. The Mapledurham MS. To Martha Blount.
3. The Arthur A. Houghton, Jr. MS. To Judith Cowper.
   (*a*) The related B.M. Add. MS. 28101 in the Cowper papers.
   (*b*) The related Spalding MS. (lost).
4. The duplicate printed texts appearing simultaneously on 17 November 1724 in the *British Journal* and the *Whitehall Evening Post*.
5. The Longleat, Portland MS. XIII, f. 11, dated 21 February 1724/5, and sent to Edward, Earl of Oxford. The source of
   (*a*) contemporary transcript B.M. Harley 7316, and
   (*b*) the 1849 transcript in the Morgan Library.
6. B.M. Stowe 964. Written on an end fly-leaf of Bacon's *Essays* and sent in 1725 by Pope to Mrs. Newsham, sister of James Craggs, Secretary of State.
7. The authorized 'a' text printed in *Miscellany Poems*, vol. i, 5th edition, 1726.

The Longleat and Stowe manuscripts (5, 6), made more than a year and a half after the original composition, are in essential agreement with the earlier manuscripts, but are set apart from them by two new readings: *gay Conscience* for *glad Conscience*, and by a wholly recast thirteenth line beginning with *Let*. In the Longleat manuscript it reads: 'Let the soft soul in some mild dream remove'. In the Stowe manuscript it reads: 'Let the mild soul in some soft dream remove'.

The first printed version (4) cannot be clearly tied to any of the known manuscripts. It differs from them at six important points in such ways as to make one suspect a very careless compositor who misread *and spirit* for *inspirit* and *tear* for *fear*. But a bad compositor could hardly go so far as to read *sigh* for *pain* or *face* for *frame*. Since all the variants are duplicated in the simultaneous publications, the only conclusion we can safely venture is that Pope had nothing to do with that publication. Mr. 'G. L.', who transmitted the verses to the *British Journal*,[1] may have derived his text from someone who had memorized the lines, or he may have had a copy of a copy sufficiently remote from its original to account for the great number of textual accidents. At all events, the poem seems to have had quick and wide circulation in manuscript, with or without Pope's leave.

The first authorized version in the *Miscellany Poems*, 1726, has no

[1] G. L.'s letter to the *Journal* is printed in Ault's *New Light*, p. 197.

distinct link with the 'desk' copy, and it departs in some detail from all the preceding texts. But it seems to be a thoroughly normal child of all the antecedent manuscripts in the order in which they have been listed.

Let me remind the reader in closing that this discussion has concerned itself only with the 'a' texts. Pope still made four more alterations in basic pattern before he had finished ringing changes upon his theme and was ready to present the twenty-line 'e' text to the public in 1738 as his last thoughts upon the 'very true and very warm' sentiments of 1723.

JOHNSON'S POETIC IMAGINATION

By Susie I. Tucker and Henry Gifford

THE reader of Johnson's poetry is struck by its metaphorical force, in spite of what Boswell asserts to the contrary:

> His mind was so full of imagery, that he might have been perpetually a poet; yet it is remarkable, that, however rich his prose is in this respect, his poetical pieces, in general, have not much of that splendour, but are rather distinguished by strong sentiment and acute observation, . . .[1]

The profusion of imagery in Johnson's prose was noted too by Monboddo, who 'disapproved of the richness of Johnson's language [in the *Journey to the Western Islands*], and of his frequent use of metaphorical expressions'. Johnson, when told this by Boswell, said in reply:

> '. . . . as to metaphorical expression, that is a great excellence in style, when it is used with propriety, for it gives you two ideas for one;—conveys the meaning more luminously, and generally with a perception of delight.'[2]

This 'great excellence in style', though perhaps more prominent in his prose, is by no means confined to it. Indeed, Johnson's poetry as a whole makes an incessant use of metaphor, to a degree unusual among poets in the Augustan tradition.

To test the truth of these comments we propose to examine the nature of his poetic imagination, and the specific methods by which he communicates it in *The Vanity of Human Wishes*. We do not attempt a study of Johnson's imagery, at least as he understood the word:[3] it is rather an

[1] *Life*, ed. Hill and Powell (Oxford, 1934), iv. 428; also v. 17. [2] Ibid., iii. 173–4.

[3] Johnson himself offers these definitions:

Image. 5. A representation of anything to the mind; a picture drawn in the fancy.

To image. v.a. To copy by the fancy; to imagine.

Imagery. 3. Copies of the fancy; false ideas; imaginary phantasms.

4. Representations in writing; such descriptions as force the image of a thing upon the mind.

In his use of this group of words, Johnson keeps uppermost the idea of mental picture-making—photographic reproduction rather than the free and selective rearrangements of the artist. In the *Rambler*, 92, he speaks of the force of imagination which gives full possession of every object: in No. 74 of authors whose force of fancy enables them to impress images strongly on their own mind: and in No. 94 he refers to Milton's 'representation of Raphael, which equally delights the ear and the imagination'.

With these comments, we may compare the definitions of Bailey's *Dictionary* (1730):

> Images [in *Rhetorick*] the use of them is to paint things naturally, and to shew them clearly. [In *Poetry*] their end is to cause Astonishment and Surprise. [In *Discourse*] any thoughts proper to produce Expressions and which present a kind of Picture to the Mind; or in a more *limited Sense*, such Discourses as some Persons, when by a kind of Enthusiasm or extraordinary Emotion of the Soul, they seem to see things whereof they speak.

inquiry into his use of metaphor, which he defines in the *Dictionary* as 'a simile comprized in a word', giving as an example: 'the spring *wakes* the flowers'. For Johnson 'words are the daughters of earth, and . . . things are the sons of heaven';[1] he never lost sight of the thing behind the word, the word being no more than a conventional sign. 'Words are but the images of things' he said in the 70th *Idler*, and in the *Life of Dryden* he speaks of words '[drawing] that attention on themselves which they should transmit to things'. He was keenly critical of the faulty imagination revealed in 'broken metaphor'. Perhaps the most flagrant example was found in Addison:

> Fir'd with that name—
> I bridle in my struggling Muse with pain,
> That longs to launch into a nobler [bolder] strain.

On which Johnson remarks: 'To *bridle* a *goddess* is no very delicate idea; but why must she be *bridled*? because she *longs to launch*; an act which was never hindered by a *bridle*: and whither will she *launch*? into a *nobler strain*. She is in the first line a *horse*, in the second a *boat*; and the care of the poet is to keep his *horse* or his *boat* from *singing*.'[2] In the same *Life* he quotes a couplet in which Pope imitates Addison:

> The well-sung woes will soothe my pensive ghost;
> He best can paint them who shall feel them most.

Again the comment is severe: 'Martial exploits may be *painted*; perhaps *woes* may be *painted*; but they are surely not *painted* by being *well-sung*: it is not easy to paint in song or to sing in colours'.[3] Johnson himself never 'confounds the images', though, as we shall note later, he has his own way of managing transitions from one brief image to the next.

In *The Vanity of Human Wishes* the metaphorical force is often literally 'comprized in a word', and that word usually is a verb: 'Time *hovers* o'er, impatient to destroy' (259). Time appears to be a vulture. This is borne out by l. 36: 'Tho' confiscation's vulturs hover round', a metaphor that recalls the image in Pope's *Iliad*, xi: 'And hovering vultures scream around their prey', and anticipates Johnson's remark in *The Adventurer*, 119, about men 'who hover like vultures round the owner of a fossil, in hopes to plunder his cabinet at his death'. Similarly, the verb and the verbal adjective create the metaphor in 'Still *drops* some joy from *with'ring* life away' (306). What Johnson sees here is the autumnal tree; and most likely he had in mind a passage from Pope's *Iliad*, vi:

> Like leaves on trees the race of man is found,
> Now green in youth, now withering on the ground;
> Another race the following spring supplies;

[1] Preface to the *Dictionary*.
[2] *Lives*, ed. Hill (Oxford, 1905), ii. 128.
[3] Ibid., p. 129.

They fall successive, and successive rise.
So generations in their course decay;
So flourish these, when those are passed away.

The ideas of succession and decay are reproduced in the first line of Johnson's couplet: 'Year chases year, decay pursues decay.' Many years later, in 1772, the image from Homer occurred to him when he wrote to Queeney Thrale: 'Miss Porter has buried her fine black cat. So things come and go. Generations, as Homer says, are but like leaves; and you now see the faded leaves falling about you.'[1]

Latinisms clearly evoked in Johnson's mind an image no less vivid than that evoked by a plain English word. Evidence of a lively response to Latin metaphor appears in his letter to Mrs. Thrale: 'But *Tempus edax rerum*, and no way has been yet found to draw his teeth.'[2] In prose writing it was Johnson's usual practice to bring out the metaphor implicit in a latinate word by the use of amplifying terms in English. Thus, in *Rambler*, 156:

> It is not always possible without a close inspection to separate the genuine *shoots* of consequential reasoning, which *grow out* of some radical postulate, from the *branches* which art has ingrafted on it.

The whole sentence, it may be said, 'grows out of' the word *radical*.[3]

But in his poetry he relies on a word to make its own suggestion, and even if the sense is picked up a few lines later, his unit of thought is very often the couplet or even the single line. To elicit the meaning his reader may have to consult other parts of the poem (as with 'Time hovers o'er') or the prose works.

[1] *Letters*, ed. Chapman (Oxford, 1952), i. 287.

[2] Ibid., iii. 64.

[3] Further examples: 'Such is the necessary concatenation of our thoughts, that good and evil are linked together' (*Idler*, 44) where *linked* makes *concatenation* pictorial. So in the *Preface to Shakespeare* with 'an intrigue regularly perplexed and regularly unravelled', where the vivid *unravelled* brings the etymological meanings of *intrigue* and *perplex* alive; and 'The first care of the builder of a new system is to demolish the fabricks which are standing', with which we may compare the extended building metaphor in the preface to Lauder's *Essay on Milton*.

In *Idler*, 1, the dormant metaphors in 'He may descend into profoundness' galvanize each other into movement, but really come alive because they are followed by the visual 'or *tower* into sublimity'. *Idler*, 19 offers a full-scale example of this interaction: 'It is common for Controvertists to add one position [dead metaphor] to another till they reach the extremities of knowledge [dormant] where truth and falsehood lose their distinction. Their admirers follow them to the brink of absurdity, [dormant] and then start back from each side towards the middle point' [alive]. So Johnson enlivens what must have always been a rather technical and abstract verb in *Idler*, 78: 'he never immerges himself in the stream of conversation, but tries to catch his companions in the eddy.' The same effect may be obtained by coupling words whose literal meaning we might hardly remember if we had one of the pair only: as in *Rambler*, 122—'Experience soon shows us the tortuosities of imaginary rectitude, the complications of simplicity, and the asperities of smoothness.'

'Must dull Suspence corrupt the stagnant mind?' (344). This line should make a strong impact upon the senses. Johnson thus defines *corrupt* in the *Dictionary*: 'To turn from a sound to a putrescent state; to infect.' *Stagnant* of course means 'not flowing; not running.'[1] Imlac counsels Nekayah: 'Do not suffer life to stagnate; it will grow muddy for want of motion: commit yourself again to the current of the world.'[2] In the metaphor describing what 'dull Suspence' does to the mind, Johnson sees the mantling slime, as perhaps Thomson saw it in l. 268 of *Britannia*: 'And the whole state in broad corruption sinks.'

If the verbal *stagnant* brings home the stench in Johnson's metaphor, the verb *survey* lights up the scene in that opening couplet so often criticized:

> Let observation with extensive view,
> Survey mankind, from China to Peru.

Johnson wishes to present a scene like that in *Paradise Lost*, xi. 377 f., where Adam on the height looks down over the world, and sweeps his gaze, as Johnson would have the observer sweep his, from China to Peru. This meaning is supplied by the word *survey*,[3] which Johnson defines in the first place as 'To overlook; to have under the view', giving as his example *Paradise Lost*, iii. 555 f.: 'Round he surveys and well might where he stood So high above.'

Just as the metaphor is often 'comprized in a word', so it is seldom developed much beyond the couplet or even the single line. Johnson does

[1] Cf. *Idler*, 30: 'the idle and luxurious find life stagnate for want of some desire to keep it in motion', and 22, which accepts the political transferred sense of *corruption* and brings it back to all the vigour of its earlier meaning: 'To the community, sedition is a fever, corruption is a gangrene, and idleness an atrophy.' In *Rambler*, 165, he speaks of the stream of life, which, 'if it is not ruffled by obstructions, will grow putrid by stagnation'.

[2] *Rasselas*, ch. xxxiv.

[3] Twentieth-century readers, with minds full of social or science surveys, may be in danger of feeling the verb *to survey* to be either technical or a pretentious synonym for *look at*. It is true that the idea of looking on the level with a careful, comprehensive view occurs in the eighteenth century, but examples could be multiplied of the idea of looking down from a height: e.g.

> Whose judgment plac'd in a superior height,
> All things surveys with comprehensive sight. . . .
> (Lady Winchilsea, *Lady Worsley at Longleat*)

Pope, *Rape of the Lock*, v. 55–56; *Essay on Man*, iv. 73–76: and the whole context of 'we tremble to survey' in the *Essay on Criticism*, ii. 219–32. In Pope's *Homer*, the gods and goddesses—Jove, Saturnia, the Sun—frequently survey the world from Ida's top or Olympus' brow, as in:

> High on the cloudy point his seat he placed;
> Thence his broad eye the subject world surveys. (*Iliad*, viii)

The verb is found associated with such words as *extensive* or *spacious*, indicative of the broad as opposed to the narrow view, and this is well illustrated by Isaac Watts in *The Improvement of the Mind*, which Johnson admired: 'it is impossible for any one to pass a right judgment concerning [human actions] without entering into most of these circumstances and surveying them extensively. . . .'

not, like Pope in many passages of the *Essay on Criticism*, pursue his train of thought, even to the length of a paragraph, by means of a single metaphor. He prefers 'pointed sentences' which singly by their concentrated force, and by irresistible weight in their full procession, drive deep into the reader's mind:

> Remark each anxious toil, each eager strife,
> And watch the busy scenes of crouded life;
> Then say how hope and fear, desire and hate,
> O'erspread with snares the clouded maze of fate,
> Where wav'ring man, betray'd by vent'rous pride,
> To tread the dreary paths without a guide,
> As treach'rous phantoms in the mist delude,
> Shuns fancied ills, or chases airy good;
> How rarely reason guides the stubborn choice,
> Rules the bold hand, or prompts the suppliant voice;
> How nations sink, by darling schemes oppress'd,
> When vengeance listens to the fool's request.
> Fate wings with ev'ry wish th' afflictive dart,
> Each gift of nature, and each grace of art,
> With fatal heat impetuous courage glows,
> With fatal sweetness elocution flows,
> Impeachment stops the speaker's pow'rful breath,
> And restless fire precipitates on death. (3–20)

The scene spread below gradually reveals a 'felde ful of folke . . . bisi . . . abouten þe mase'[1] (3–6); 'wav'ring man', the representative individual, emerges from the crowd like Christian leaving the City of Destruction, 'To tread the dreary paths without a guide' (in the last point, of course, differing from Christian). But this image is broken off when he 'chases airy good' (10) and from that point he enters political life, either at court or in parliament, and already we have our first glimpse of Charles XII ('How nations sink, by darling schemes oppress'd'), of Wolsey, and of Laud. The notion of Fate (15) ties together several disparate images referring to political dangers: 'th' afflictive dart' possibly suggests the disease-bearing shafts of Apollo at Troy; and the two main images in the two final couplets—courage glowing with fire, and the stream of eloquence —are interlaced in chiasmic fashion, so that the fire appearing first—the 'fatal heat' of l. 17—at the finish 'precipitates on death'.

Similarly the passage on the afflictions of a virtuous old age has a fairly complicated series of images, which are bound together by various devices:

> Yet ev'n on this her load Misfortune flings,
> To press the weary minutes flagging wings:
> New sorrow rises as the day returns,

[1] Langland, *Piers Plowman*, B. 1. 2–6.

A sister sickens, or a daughter mourns.
Now kindred Merit fills the sable bier,
Now lacerated Friendship claims a tear,
Year chases year, decay pursues decay,
Still drops some joy from with'ring life away;
New forms arise, and diff'rent views engage,
Superfluous lags the vet'ran on the stage,
Till pitying Nature signs the last release,
And bids afflicted worth retire to peace. (299–310)

In the first line the pilgrim's load is transferred by the verb *press* to the flagging wings of time; sorrow rises instead of the sun (this metaphor returns in l. 312, 'Who set unclouded in the gulphs of fate'); mangled friendship suggests pursuit, perhaps in the hunt, and decay. Then follows the withering tree (we have already noted the Homeric allusion) and the new forms that grow to supplant it; and this theme of the generations introduces the seven ages of man ('All the world 's a stage'); on the stage is a veteran, whose discharge from the wars is signed by pitying nature in the conclusion. These images are connected either by the logic of imagination (from *lacerate* to *chase*, from *decay* to the tree), or by correspondences of thought ('the weary minutes' contrasted with 'Year chases year'), or by syntax ('New sorrow rises', 'New forms arise').

It is noticeable that the images commonly used by Johnson fall into several well-defined groups. For example the line 'Rebellion's vengeful talons seize on Laud' (168) recalls the vultures mentioned above, and it is striking how often various forms of this image—the devouring bird or beast of prey—are found in his writings. He may well have had in mind Prometheus torn by the vulture, or Tityos in *Aeneid*, vi:

A rav'nous vulture in his open side,
Her crooked beak and cruel talons try'd.[1]

So he speaks in a letter of 'being griped by the talons of necessity',[2] and 'the gripe of time'[3] may be interpreted as a vulture's in the light of l. 259: 'Time hovers o'er, impatient to destroy', and this in its turn might illuminate the metaphor from *Idler*, 25: 'brushed by the wing of time'. (For Cowper in *The Task*, iv. 211 f., time, it may be noted, 'has a dove's wing'. Contrast *Irene*, v. ix. 8–9: 'The fraudful Moments ply their silent Wings/ And steal thy Life away.'

If Johnson sees man as the victim assailed by birds of prey, he is also

[1] Dryden's translation, ll. 808–9.
[2] *Letters*, iii. 22. Dr. Chapman refers to the same phrase in *Rambler*, 113.
[3] *Rambler*, 48.

constantly aware of the ravages of disease. The last trials to be overcome by the student are disease and melancholy:

> Should no Disease thy torpid veins invade,
> Nor Melancholy's phantoms haunt thy shade; . . . (153–4)

The notion of torpor is a favourite with Johnson, witness the clumsy play Lexiphanes makes with the word *torpid* and its congeners in his skit. Its nineteenth-century use as a technical term in pathology is foreshadowed by Johnson, and by Armstrong in *The Art of Preserving Health* (1744):

> Where the Mind a torpid winter leads,
> Wrapt in a Body corpulent and cold,
> And each clogg'd function lazily moves on. . . . (iv. 441–3)

Johnson very often adduces torpor as the outcome of melancholy: 'torpid apathy' (*Idler*, 25), 'torpid under the frigid influence of melancholy' (*Idler*, 47), 'torpid despondency' (*Adventurer*, 81). Of Miss Williams he wrote: 'She . . . is wearing out, by torpid inappetence and wearisome decay.'[1]

Disease *invades* the body. This metaphor is repeated later in *The Vanity of Human Wishes:*

> Unnumber'd maladies his joints invade,
> Lay siege to life and press the dire blockade; . . . (283–4)

It seems to arise less often in Johnson's prose, but there are other references to life as a warfare upon earth in *The Vanity*, e.g. 41, 'Now fears in dire vicissitude invade', 22, 'the gen'ral massacre of gold', 308, 'the vet'ran on the stage', and even perhaps 332, 'The rival batters, and the lover mines'. His liking for these violent images is explained by Boswell in the passage that may have suggested to Mr. Bronson the admirable phrase 'Johnson Agonistes':

> His mind resembled the vast amphitheatre, the Colisaeum at Rome. In the centre stood his judgment, which, like a mighty gladiator, combated those apprehensions that, like the wild beasts of the *Arena*, were all around in cells, ready to be let out upon him. After a conflict, he drove them back into their dens; but not killing them, they were still assailing him.[2]

The image and its expression might have come from Johnson himself; they show to what extent Boswell was at home in Johnson's imagination, an imagination haunted by the ideas of struggle in life, with advance and retreat, growth, and decay.

Something has already been said of the latter notion. It appears in countless forms, and hardly a page of Johnson's writing is without it. Again and again he opposes the bloom and the blast; the flame and the

[1] *Letters*, iii. 61.

[2] *Life*, ii. 106.

extinguishing wind; light and darkness; rising and falling; vigour and lassitude. The process is seen at its grandest in a passage like the following from the *Preface to Shakespeare:*

> The tide of seeming knowledge which is poured over one generation, retires and leaves another naked and barren; the sudden meteors of intelligence which for a while appear to shoot their beams into the regions of obscurity, on a sudden withdraw their lustre, and leave mortals again to grope their way.

But the master image which lurks never far from Johnson's thinking is surely that of 'Time like an ever-rolling stream': 'the flux of years', as he calls it in the *Preface to Shakespeare*, and again, 'The stream of time, which is continually washing the dissoluble fabricks of . . . poets', and sweeping away the traces of individual existence. He cannot forget that eventually 'the bubbles that float upon the rivulet of life [must] be lost for ever in the gulph of eternity',[1] and both 'the torrent of fate' and 'the gulphs of fate' are necessarily found in his fullest poetic statement on human life. This metaphor is drawn out to a sustained allegory in *Rambler*, 102.

Images so inevitable (for this, given Johnson's temperament, they seem to be) are 'the sons of ravage'. They speak directly from his experience, never losing their force, and never becoming trite or conventional. They bring to his writings, whether in verse or prose, a remarkable unity of tone, although in verse their effect is heightened, both because they come more abundantly, and because they are used each with a stricter economy and a sharper point. In the last analysis the pleasure of Johnson's poetry is mainly imparted by the images, which give general truth a most moving personal ring. The essential Johnson is shown in them endeavouring 'to analyse the mind, to trace the passions to their sources, . . . or sound the depths of the heart for the motives of action'.[2]

[1] *Idler*, 89.

[2] *Preface to Shakespeare.*

INTERPRETATION OF *THE ANCIENT MARINER*

By J. W. R. PURSER

INTERPRETATIONS of the 'symbolism' of *The Ancient Mariner* have been many and varied. While I incline towards E. E. Stoll's condemnation[1] of the more audacious flights of Kenneth Burke,[2] and even of Robert Penn Warren,[3] I nevertheless agree with the latter in his interesting survey of Coleridge's attitude towards symbolism and the use of the supernatural in poetry; and with Humphrey House in his conviction that the poem is not without its symbolic suggestions of various kinds.[4] Even if we had not the backing of Coleridge's own theory of Imagination to prove it, it would seem incredible that *The Ancient Mariner* was a fantasy without meaning. Only a mind stimulated by the belief that it was expressing some truth of importance could have produced a fantasy so well-knit, lively, and in every way convincing.

The trouble about many of the interpretations of the poem (notable exceptions being the articles by G. H. Clarke and H. F. Scott-Thomas)[5] is that they often either neglect or contradict the very simple indications for the reader's guidance given by Coleridge himself either in the text or in the 1817 marginal gloss. Where this is not done, I should not be loath to admit meanings to the poem only loosely connected with the main matter; for poets may, indeed, often say more than they mean to say, and this may sometimes be important. Nevertheless, to get the intended meaning right is essential before we start examining the unintended meanings, and I do not think that the intended meaning of *The Ancient Mariner* has yet been rightly expounded. In particular it seems to me clear that Coleridge tells us that the leading theme is a description of the Mariner's life-in-death (the figure Life-in-Death—though of course she is present in the 1798 version—was first named in that of 1817, presumably to make the idea more apparent), and that none of the interpretations stresses this properly, or indeed brings out fully the meaning of the killing of the Albatross. With the indications that Coleridge has given us, in text and gloss, I think that it is not difficult, without undue stretching of the imagination, to read the work as an expression of one simple but significant idea.

[1] *P.M.L.A.*, lxiii (1948), 214–33.
[2] *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (Baton-Rouge, 1941).
[3] *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner, an Essay* (New York, 1946).
[4] *Coleridge* (London, 1953).
[5] *Queen's Quarterly*, xl (1933), 27–45; *Dalhousie Review*, xviii (1938), 348–54.

At the outset of *The Ancient Mariner* we are presented with two opposing worlds, the world of the Wedding-Guest, in which marriage and giving in marriage is one of the important events, and that of the Mariner, who has evidently been compelled by his destiny (or his own mental constitution) to give his allegiance to a more spiritual view of things. To the ordinary man the Mariner is frightening, with his appearance of fanaticism and of painful experience; but he knows by instinct that there are others called to the same destiny as he, and the one Wedding-Guest of three on whom he seizes, and whom he holds entranced by his tale, is one of these. His tale, then, is of the manner in which he was claimed by his destiny, and made the type of man he is; though, as it turns out, he rebelled against this destiny, and was forced to suffer on that account.

In Part I the Mariner embarks on a description of his voyage, explaining how all had gone well with him and his fellows till a storm overtook them, driving them southwards, and they were lost in mist among snow and ice. It was in the land of ice (that is, when they first met with their real troubles and had been driven to the extremes of the earth) that they were visited by the Albatross:

> At length did cross an Albatross:
> Thorough the fog it came;
> As if it had been a Christian soul,
> We hailed it in God's name.

In their difficulties the other sailors recognize the Albatross for a bird of good omen, and feed it, and are cheered by it; but the Mariner himself, who feels more definitely than they the intrusion of a spiritual thing into their lives (for the peril of their situation, and the loneliness and strangeness of the bird are alone enough to awaken feelings of the supernatural, and make them hail it 'in God's name'), is resentful of it, and kills it.

In Part II the Mariner tells how the others take this. At first they are horrified:

> Ah wretch! said they, the bird to slay,
> That made the breeze to blow!

But then they excuse the deed because the fair wind continues and the sun comes out:

> 'Twas right, said they, such birds to slay,
> That bring the fog and mist.

They have no clear sense of the distinction between spiritual and worldly good, and their kindly feelings towards the Albatross are easily put by when they think that perhaps it has been harmful to them in a worldly way. Now, however, a tropical calm follows, and they again blame the Mariner, though they themselves have become 'accomplices in the crime' by justify-

ing it. That we should make a religious application all along is indicated by the references to God and Christ and Mary Queen of Heaven; and the religious meaning is further stressed here by the hanging about the neck of the Mariner 'Instead of the cross, the Albatross'.[1] The slaying of the Albatross has meant a refusal to acknowledge the spiritual truth,[2] and we are reminded of the Crucifixion in relation to it. Further reminders of this are given to us later in lines 404–5, where the Albatross is referred to as

> the bird that loved the man
> Who shot him with his bow.

and in lines 512–13,

> He'll shrive my soul, he'll wash away
> The Albatross's blood.

The whole crew is implicated in the death of its heavenly visitant, and so is itself devoted to death. The Mariner, however, who actually did the slaying, is reserved for a greater punishment (but also for a greater privilege, for the religious man is most keenly sensitive to both good and evil), the punishment of having reluctantly to endure a life-in-death; and in Part III this is presented graphically to us by the advent of the spectre-bark with its inhabitants Death and 'the Nightmare Life-in-Death', who are dicing for the souls of the crew. Death wins them all except for the Mariner himself, who has to live on. The gradual and eerie appearance of the spectre ship—its tacking towards them, and halting before the sun's red disk, which shows through its ribs as through prison bars—makes us feel how closely the affairs of hell are involved in those of heaven. The ship and its two inhabitants, like the Polar Spirit, the spirit of the wind, &c., are all ultimately under the control and at the bidding of God. The departure of the spectre-bark is followed by the death of all the crew but the Mariner; and each one as he drops turns to curse him with his eye. They were all simple people, who accepted the confused claims of spiritual and worldly things without question, and will each one have his own fate; but he who has been somehow more sharply aware of the difference, and of the fact that a thorough acceptance of the spiritual values involves a sacrifice of the worldly ones, and who has consequently tried to deny their claim

[1] 'Instead of the cross' does not, I think, necessarily mean, as has been supposed, that a cross is actually removed from the Mariner's neck and the Albatross substituted, but only that the Albatross was hung there for the same purpose as that for which a person wears a cross—i.e. as a reminder and sign of his share in the general sin of mankind, and in this case as a mark of special guilt.

[2] Maud Bodkin (*Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* (London, 1934), p. 58) appears to me to describe the episode rightly when she says: 'Such a refusal, or violation of fellowship—of the Kingdom of Heaven—seems to be the crime . . . of the Mariner.'

At the outset of *The Ancient Mariner* we are presented with two opposing worlds, the world of the Wedding-Guest, in which marriage and giving in marriage is one of the important events, and that of the Mariner, who has evidently been compelled by his destiny (or his own mental constitution) to give his allegiance to a more spiritual view of things. To the ordinary man the Mariner is frightening, with his appearance of fanaticism and of painful experience; but he knows by instinct that there are others called to the same destiny as he, and the one Wedding-Guest of three on whom he seizes, and whom he holds entranced by his tale, is one of these. His tale, then, is of the manner in which he was claimed by his destiny, and made the type of man he is; though, as it turns out, he rebelled against this destiny, and was forced to suffer on that account.

In Part I the Mariner embarks on a description of his voyage, explaining how all had gone well with him and his fellows till a storm overtook them, driving them southwards, and they were lost in mist among snow and ice. It was in the land of ice (that is, when they first met with their real troubles and had been driven to the extremes of the earth) that they were visited by the Albatross:

> At length did cross an Albatross:
> Thorough the fog it came;
> As if it had been a Christian soul,
> We hailed it in God's name.

In their difficulties the other sailors recognize the Albatross for a bird of good omen, and feed it, and are cheered by it; but the Mariner himself, who feels more definitely than they the intrusion of a spiritual thing into their lives (for the peril of their situation, and the loneliness and strangeness of the bird are alone enough to awaken feelings of the supernatural, and make them hail it 'in God's name'), is resentful of it, and kills it.

In Part II the Mariner tells how the others take this. At first they are horrified:

> Ah wretch! said they, the bird to slay,
> That made the breeze to blow!

But then they excuse the deed because the fair wind continues and the sun comes out:

> 'Twas right, said they, such birds to slay,
> That bring the fog and mist.

They have no clear sense of the distinction between spiritual and worldly good, and their kindly feelings towards the Albatross are easily put by when they think that perhaps it has been harmful to them in a worldly way. Now, however, a tropical calm follows, and they again blame the Mariner, though they themselves have become 'accomplices in the crime' by justify-

ing it. That we should make a religious application all along is indicated by the references to God and Christ and Mary Queen of Heaven; and the religious meaning is further stressed here by the hanging about the neck of the Mariner 'Instead of the cross, the Albatross'.[1] The slaying of the Albatross has meant a refusal to acknowledge the spiritual truth,[2] and we are reminded of the Crucifixion in relation to it. Further reminders of this are given to us later in lines 404–5, where the Albatross is referred to as

> the bird that loved the man
> Who shot him with his bow.

and in lines 512–13,

> He'll shrive my soul, he'll wash away
> The Albatross's blood.

The whole crew is implicated in the death of its heavenly visitant, and so is itself devoted to death. The Mariner, however, who actually did the slaying, is reserved for a greater punishment (but also for a greater privilege, for the religious man is most keenly sensitive to both good and evil), the punishment of having reluctantly to endure a life-in-death; and in Part III this is presented graphically to us by the advent of the spectre-bark with its inhabitants Death and 'the Nightmare Life-in-Death', who are dicing for the souls of the crew. Death wins them all except for the Mariner himself, who has to live on. The gradual and eerie appearance of the spectre ship—its tacking towards them, and halting before the sun's red disk, which shows through its ribs as through prison bars—makes us feel how closely the affairs of hell are involved in those of heaven. The ship and its two inhabitants, like the Polar Spirit, the spirit of the wind, &c., are all ultimately under the control and at the bidding of God. The departure of the spectre-bark is followed by the death of all the crew but the Mariner; and each one as he drops turns to curse him with his eye. They were all simple people, who accepted the confused claims of spiritual and worldly things without question, and will each one have his own fate; but he who has been somehow more sharply aware of the difference, and of the fact that a thorough acceptance of the spiritual values involves a sacrifice of the worldly ones, and who has consequently tried to deny their claim

[1] 'Instead of the cross' does not, I think, necessarily mean, as has been supposed, that a cross is actually removed from the Mariner's neck and the Albatross substituted, but only that the Albatross was hung there for the same purpose as that for which a person wears a cross—i.e. as a reminder and sign of his share in the general sin of mankind, and in this case as a mark of special guilt.

[2] Maud Bodkin (*Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* (London, 1934), p. 58) appears to me to describe the episode rightly when she says: 'Such a refusal, or violation of fellowship—of the Kingdom of Heaven—seems to be the crime . . . of the Mariner.'

(Coleridge does not say all this, but the poem as a whole, and especially the Wedding Feast setting, implies it) has involved them all in death, as all humanity for its blindness is involved in death in the end.

In Part IV the Wedding-Guest, who has by now been drawn into the Mariner's experience, expresses his fear of the Mariner, which is the same fear as the Mariner himself tells us he had felt when all his mates died, the fear of death, or rather (for it is to be the same for this Wedding-Guest as for the object of his fear) that of living a life-in-death.

> Fear at my heart, as at a cup,
> My life-blood seemed to sip!

the Mariner has said, telling of an experience that others, on first feeling obliged to dedicate themselves to the life of the spirit, have also described.

The more difficult parts of the poem come now, for we have now to follow Coleridge's conception of what it is to live a life-in-death. The fantasy, however, is wonderfully sustained; and few people will have known better than Coleridge himself what it was to feel called to this state of being, and how much reluctance and hungering for worldly good was involved. The only way to live a life-in-death, the poem indicates, is by a subordination of all other values to those of love, and by an utter surrender of self and selfish interests to love. The Mariner has never attained the perfect state; and still he knows no peace of soul, for his agony returns on him, forcing him to tell his story to others, and to make converts to the higher life, in which, no doubt, some will find peace and happiness, but others, like the Mariner himself, will be used by God to wander about the earth disturbing its tranquillity, and forcing upon it a recognition of the ultimately spiritual nature of all things through an insistence on the facts of death and pain.

In this fourth part, then, the Mariner's efforts to reconcile himself to his new state begin. We are told first of a feeling of utter loneliness on his part:

> Alone, alone, all, all alone,
> Alone on a wide wide sea!
> And never a saint took pity on
> My soul in agony;

and then of the hideousness of the world as it appears to him. There had been some beauty in his life in the past, and he remembers his comrades when they were alive as having been beautiful; but now that they are all dead, and he has been separated from that world, and has not yet been able to enter into the new, everything appears loathsome to him. The real world before his eyes is a world doomed to death, a world of dead men and of 'a

thousand, thousand slimy things' crawling upon the sea—and that other hateful and slimy thing, himself:

> The many men, so beautiful!
> And they all dead did lie:
> And a thousand thousand slimy things
> Lived on; and so did I.

Loathing of the world and of oneself is again a recognized stage in the perception of spiritual truth, but of course no one feels that he wants or ought to rest in it, and the Mariner desires to pray so that he may save himself from it. He is unable to pray, however; a 'wicked whisper' comes and makes his 'heart as dry as dust'. Coleridge does not inform us what this 'wicked whisper' is, trusting no doubt that his readers will be able to supply the meaning for themselves, for few have not known the mood of complete despair, in which such rot and decay and parching agony as the Mariner is now witnessing appear as the ultimate truth of things, and the temptation to take one's own life is near. All the time, however, the dead men continue to look at him with the curse in their eyes, which accuses ***him*** of the wrong; and so he lives on in this state 'seven days and seven nights' longing for death, and yet afraid to follow the promptings of the 'wicked whisper' and take it. Then restoration gradually begins; and Coleridge seems to give it as his experience that it comes slowly and by degrees, with no recognizable one cause. Partly, it seems, it is the persistent curse in the dead men's eyes that works upon him, and makes him realize that the fault is in himself, but also it is the loveliness of the moonlight, which, like the blessing of God, streams over the ship and the 'charmed water' night after night. He begins to see the 'slimy things' not as 'slimy things' but as beautiful water-snakes; and a spring of love gushes from his heart, and he blesses them unaware:

> That selfsame moment I could pray;
> And from my neck so free
> The Albatross fell off, and sank
> Like lead into the sea.

In Part v the restoration is continued. Rain falls, a roaring wind is heard far off, and the sky becomes filled with strange sights of dancing stars and flaring clouds, among which is one black cloud from which sheeted lightning pours down in a constant deluge. These are the portents and wonders of the new life, the whole atmosphere being charged with excitement as with an electric current, while the very dead men rise and help to work the ship.[1] Coleridge's reading of travel and adventure is drawn on to supply

[1] Like the killing of the Albatross, this was Wordsworth's suggestion—which, however, Coleridge did not need to take, unless it suited his own purposes.

the supernatural appearance of a world of changed values, but his own experience is no doubt guiding the choice of details, though it is hard to follow them all. He insists more than once that the roaring wind never reaches the ship, but that the ship moves on all the same as if driven by it. Again, the account of how

> The body of my brother's son
> Stood by me, knee to knee:
> The body and I pulled at one rope,
> But he said nought to me.

will certainly have had some precise emotional significance for Coleridge, for he was a minute analyser of his own feelings. We can, however, sense the function of these and other details without being exact about them. The Mariner's working in company with the body of his brother's son makes us feel how far alienated he is from the world of instinctive human things, and how much he needs to make contact with it again. Something similar is surely symbolized by the roar of the distant wind. The Mariner's life is being conducted neither by natural forces nor directly by God, but by God through the medium of his supernatural agents. It is blessed Spirits who are animating the dead bodies, and the ship has been moved (since the Mariner's prayer, in obedience to them) by the Spirit from the South Pole. In fact, though he does not recognize it himself, the grace of heaven has come to the Mariner's aid in his estrangement from the normal course of things. This is the result of his prayer; and he hears sweet sounds and has happy thoughts to comfort him in the midst of his grim experience, while still he has penance to do, for still the angered Polar Spirit wishes vengeance to be exacted for the bird that had been under its protection.

In this section, therefore, the Mariner is living a life apart from the world, wrapped up in his inward thoughts and experiences. With the departure of the Polar Spirit, the 'short uneasy motion' of the ship to and fro when she reaches the line, and the long trance of the Mariner, during which he is moved with a rapidity too great for waking human senses to endure (this surely too, though it is necessary for the geography of the poem, reflects some personal experience), he is brought back to the real world again, which will, however, be haunted for him for ever after by an awareness of spiritual presences.

In Part VI he hears two of these spiritual presences speaking like voices in a dream while he is being borne along in his trance as into a vacuum. He wakes, however, and the final expiation of the curse against him takes place—like the preliminary one, when he first found himself able to pray, gradually and with mixed feelings of joy and fear. He can see the ocean around him, and can feel once more the wind breathing upon him. It

breathes on him alone, though, not on the ship:[1] he is still in some sense separated from the world he has come back to; and so he will always remain, even after the spirits have brought him back to the harbour whence he set out, and the familiar sights of home.

The final part, Part VII, gives an account of his home-coming. There has been, I think, at any rate since the death of the rest of the crew, a suggestion running through the imagery that the ship and its occupants stand for the Mariner's corporeal life as opposed to his thinking and feeling soul, and that something in him died with the rest of the mariners when Life-in-Death won him, and plain Death won them. Now at his first meeting with living human beings again—the Pilot, his boy, and the Hermit of the Wood—the spirits who have manned the ship by animating the bodies of the crew take their departure, and the ship with all its dead men sinks beneath the Mariner. The Mariner, though brought back to the real world of men, is himself more a spirit than a body, and the sight of him is terrifying to the Pilot and the Pilot's boy, who takes him for the Devil. But the Hermit is not so afraid when the Mariner rows the boat home, and begs him to hear his tale and shrive him. The Hermit is, like the Mariner, living a life-in-death or death-in-life, with the difference that he has never rebelled against that destiny but assumed it voluntarily, finding his peace in it. The difficult love, in which self has no say at all, has come easily to him, and people do not fear him as they do the Mariner, nor does he suffer such acute agonies, though all mortal creatures who strive to live that life must suffer something in the mere denial of self. Now the Wedding-Guest has been called to the same company, and the Mariner before leaving him tells him the essential rule for his guidance in the future:

> He prayeth best who loveth best
> All things both great and small;
> For the dear God who loveth us,
> He made and loveth all.

More details of the poem than have been remarked upon will no doubt register themselves as having a moral meaning to different readers, according as they happen to cross each reader's own experience. The parts, for instance, played by the Sun and the Moon, visible manifestations of God, and by the elements and the Polar Spirit, agents rather than manifestations of God, everyone feels in his blood to be stirringly significant. I do not think, however, that it is necessary to be intellectually aware of all the symbols and suggestions, provided that one is aware of the general theme,

[1] The repetition of the words 'On me alone it blew' in the 1798 text makes it clear that this is not just an expression of regret on the Mariner's part for the death of his comrades.

and can pick up the details here and there as they seem specially significant to one's own imagination.

On the other hand, an intellectual awareness of the general theme of *The Ancient Mariner* does seem necessary, for it is that which makes the poem not just the strange and wonderful fantasy which everyone, whether he understands it or no, feels it to be, but a fantasy whose strangeness and wonder may be found repeated in one's own inner life.

THE LAST ENCHANTMENTS

By A. E. Dyson

The Scholar Gipsy is undoubtedly a finer poem than Dr. Leavis's assessment in *The Common Pursuit* (p. 30) suggests. The phrases used there are 'weak confusion' and 'intellectual debility'—and one must suggest, with due deference to an often perceptive critic, that these will not do at all. There is, then, cause to be grateful to Professor G. Wilson Knight for taking the poem seriously, and performing an analysis both careful and illuminating (*R.E.S.*, N.S. vi (1955), 53–62).

When this debt is acknowledged, however, it must be added that Mr. Wilson Knight's interpretation is too subjective to pass without a challenge, especially in so far as he commits himself to a theory that the wisdom of a poem is not necessarily the same as the wisdom of its poet. This theory allows Mr. Wilson Knight to attach to the poem his own wisdom, but only at the expense of ignoring what seem most likely to have been Arnold's intentions.

Mr. Wilson Knight points to the importance of oriental references in the two concluding stanzas of the poem, and tells us that 'we must accordingly search within the main body of the poem for qualities roughly corresponding to the oriental powers symbolized by the Tyrian trader'. Such 'qualities' he finds in the scholar gipsy himself, and on the strength of them is soon identifying the gipsy with Dionysian powers (as against the Apollonian Oxford of the poem), and with intuitive wisdom (as against the cold touch of analytical intellect). The gipsy has an essentially undergraduate wisdom, an 'eternal immaturity'—and this distinguishes him from the dons, whose greater knowledge has made it hard for them to retain 'wisdom'. The gipsy exemplifies 'the essence of true learning; the opening of the mind, the wonder, the intuition of fields unexplored. That is why the presiding deity of a great university [and he is no less than this] may be felt as the eternal undergraduate.' The dons are lacking in his qualities, and need his energy and freshness to preserve them from complete desiccation. These dons are symbolized by the 'One' on the 'Intellectual throne', in whom 'the essentially backward, devitalized, "realistic", thinking of the contemporary intellect is personified. The state indicated is unhealthy, nerveless, and guilty of self-pity.'

Now this is, admittedly, a possible point of view, and one from which a poem similar to *The Scholar Gipsy* could have been written. Had Blake, or Carlyle, or D. H. Lawrence had the handling of the material, it would

no doubt have come out in this sort of way. But one wonders what the author of *Literature and Dogma* and *God and the Bible* would have had to comment on such a point of view, and whether he would not have regarded the One on the 'intellectual throne' as being superior to the gipsy in insight and integrity, even though less well placed than the gipsy for the enjoyment of an 'eternal week-end' (Dr. Leavis's phrase). My contention here will be that Arnold never commits himself to the gipsy (as both Dr. Leavis and Mr. Wilson Knight assume), but that he is aware of him all the time as the embodiment of an illusion. This is the reason why *The Scholar Gipsy* has a greater strength than Dr. Leavis allows, and a greater centrality to the thought of its creator than is indicated by Mr. Wilson Knight.

'Arnold's poem', says Mr. Wilson Knight, 'confronts our western tradition with suggestions of a wisdom, lore, or magic of oriental affinities or origin.' And having said this, he assumes that the confrontation is almost entirely to the detriment of the western tradition—thereby stating his own view, but ignoring that which we know to have been Arnold's. He speaks also of 'the poem's total meaning, which strives, as its title *The Scholar Gipsy* as good as tells us, towards a fusion of two traditions, western and eastern'. But for my own part, I fail to see how the title 'as good as tells us' any such thing, unless we are predisposed to read it in this way: and in view of Mr. Wilson Knight's admission that Arnold himself might have been unaware of his poem's wisdom, it is hard to see how it could.

It might be truer to suggest that *The Scholar Gipsy* confronts the joyful illusions of an earlier age with the melancholy realism of the nineteenth century, and that in this confrontation, with its complex emotional tensions, the really moving quality of the poem is to be found. Arnold was as aware of the difficulties of 'belief' as any Victorian, and as determined as George Eliot to live and think 'without opium'. Like the majority of his contemporaries, though somewhat ahead of most of them, he had heard the 'sea of faith' retreating with its 'melancholy, long withdrawing roar'. In *God and the Bible* he does not hesitate to analogize the gospel miracles to the tale of Cinderella—pleasing, emotionally comforting, but unhappily not *true*. And because they are not true, there can be no question of our continuing to believe them merely for our own comfort.

> The more we may have been helped to be faithful, humble and charitable by taking the truth of this story, and other stories equally legendary, for granted, the greater is our embarrassment, no doubt, at having to do without them. But we have to do without them none the less on that account.

Arnold shared with many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century thinkers a disbelief in Christian and medieval thought forms, but he did not share with them an easy contempt for everything that man had believed outside

the context of 'Right Reason' and scientific empiricism. On the contrary, he recognized in the earlier culture a beauty, a joy, an emotional and moral value, that could be envied by his own perplexed and troubled age: envied, but not regained. The fact seemed to be (and 'fact', 'belief', 'truth' were much simpler concepts to the Victorians, we must remember, than they are often thought to be today) that these earlier ages were happier than the nineteenth century, but that they were also inaccessible to it; that they were capable of sustaining man in a more joyful and serene existence, but only at the cost of a certain 'want of intellectual seriousness' (nourished upon intellectual ignorance) that was no longer acceptable. The opening lines of an early poem by Yeats capture that wistful and 'High Serious' acceptance of disenchantment which is so characteristically Victorian:

> The woods of Arcady are dead
> And over is their antique joy,
> Of old the world on dreaming fed,
> Grey truth is now her painted toy.

Arnold, however, though regretting his losses, was a realist, and a prophet of the future. Behind his thought in *The Scholar Gipsy* there was, I fancy, a *Weltanschauung* not dissimilar to that of Comte. He saw the world as an evolving organism which, like a human being, had progressed through childhood and youth to maturity. The earlier 'explanations' of things, theological and metaphysical, had been those appropriate to immaturity—glad, carefree, invigorating, but not grounded in reality.[1] When the world at last came of age, it had had to put away childish things. And even if the long-awaited maturity did sometimes resemble a premature old age, with the Victorian *avant-garde* haggard under the burden of its own enlightenment, there was nothing that could be done to mend the situation. Can a man enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born? In *The Scholar Gipsy* Arnold's attitude to the gipsy is closely analogous to that of an adult towards a child. He appreciates and even envies its innocence, but realizes that no return to such a state is possible for himself. The child loses its 'innocence' not by some act of sin, nor by a defect of intellect, but merely by gaining experience and developing into an adult. The realities of adult life turn out to be less agreeable, in many respects, than childish fantasies, but there can be no question of thinking them less true.

The gipsy, like a child, is the embodiment of a good lost, not of a good

[1] 'Our religion, parading evidences such as those on which the popular mind relies now; our philosophy, pluming itself on its reasonings about causation and finite and infinite being; what are they but the shadows and dreams and false shows of knowledge? The day will come when we shall wonder at ourselves for having trusted to them, for having taken them seriously' ('The Study of Poetry', *Essays in Criticism, Second Series*).

temporarily or culpably mislaid. When Arnold contrasts the gipsy's serenity with the disquiets and perplexities of his own age, he is not satirizing the nineteenth century, or renouncing it, or criticizing it, or suggesting a remedy. He is, rather, exploring its spiritual and emotional losses, and the stoic readjustment which these will entail for it.

Dr. Leavis has written as though Arnold laid his head to sleep, and gave his heart a holiday. But Arnold's stoic acceptance of unpalatable realities is among the most impressive qualities of his best poems, and 'escapism' is not a charge we should bring against them. There is no need to insist upon the naked dignity of such statements as this:

> The world which seems
> To lie before us as a land of dreams,
> So various, so beautiful, so new
> Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
> Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain . . .

or as this:

> Not as their friend or child I speak!
> But as on some far northern strand,
> Thinking of his own gods, a Greek
> In pity and mournful awe might stand
> Before some fallen runic stone—
> For both were faiths, and both are gone. . . .

The diction and tone are their own best evidence of costly intellectual integrity. In his prose, Arnold tried hard to salvage from the Christian wreckage an 'Eternal-not-ourselves-that-makes-for-righteousness'. But in his poetry there is a sterner discipline of self-knowledge, and the full extent of the Victorian predicament—a tragic predicament for men of Arnold's temperament—is embodied.

It was not for nothing that Arnold laid stress upon the gipsy's magic art. At the Renaissance (if an old-fashioned use of this word can be allowed) man set out on a search for temporal power. Bacon, the prophet of the movement, looks forward not only to Newton and Locke, but also to the Industrial Revolution, and to the Victorian idea of 'progress'. In the sixteenth century, science and magic were the two principal techniques for gaining power. By the nineteenth century science had vindicated its material usefulness with results, magic had failed to produce results and been discredited. Science, however, had proved to have a sting in its tail, since the spiritual losses entailed by the acceptance of empiricism as a total account of reality were becoming yearly more apparent. Magic, on the other hand, could still, in fantasy, be thought of as an ideal and unqualified means of power, even though it were now known not to work. Science had become an enemy of religion and enchantment, the discoverer

of a universe of death: magic could still be identified with dreams of a richer life in a more satisfactory universe, since its very failure liberated it for poetic use as

> an abstraction
> Remaining a perpetual possibility
> Only in a world of speculation.[1]

The scholar gipsy embodies, then, the optimistic but chimerical hopes of an earlier age. He waits for 'the spark from Heaven to fall' (st. 12), but he waits in vain: the spark does not fall, as the nineteenth century has discovered for itself (st. 18–20). This realization is in the rhythms and tone of the poem, which is reflective and melancholy in the elegiac mode, not filled with dynamic hope. The gipsy is committed to a discredited art, and so exiled from Oxford. In st. 8, as he looks down on the lighted city at night, he looks not as a presiding deity but as a long superseded ghost from the past. His very nature forbids him to enter, since one touch of Victorian realism would reveal him for the wraith he is (st. 23). The situation is not unlike that of the young Jude gazing eagerly towards the lights of that same city—not to Oxford itself, however, but to the ideal city which his childish dreams have superimposed. The scholar gipsy turns away from the real Oxford, and seeks his 'straw' in 'Some sequester'd grange'. His place is with the primitive, the uncultured, the unintellectual. Only so can he survive at all, so late in history.

In *Literature and Dogma* and *God and the Bible* Arnold insists that he is writing not for those who are still happy with their Christian illusions (the Victorian version of 'simple faith'), but only for those highly serious few who still value the illusions whilst being unable honestly to accept them. The scholar gipsy would not have been one of the readers Arnold had in mind: he would have been one of the happier (though perhaps less honest) band who enjoyed the faith of earlier ages simply because they had not been intellectually awakened to reality in Oxford. The gipsy is essentially outside Oxford; and his exclusion, though it tells against the happiness of Oxford, tells even more against the acceptability of the gipsy.

A similar balance will be found in Arnold's well-known prose passage about Oxford. He expresses his love of the idealized city, 'steeped in sentiment as she lies, spreading her gardens to the moonlight, and whispering from her towers the last enchantments of the Middle Ages . . . unravaged by the fierce intellectual life of our century'. But this Oxford is a moonlit vision, a dream woven of those 'last enchantments' which Arnold was doing as much as anyone to dispel. For Arnold was not himself unravaged by the fierce intellectual life of his century, nor did he expect the other inhabitants of Oxford to be. His moonlit Oxford, like the scholar gipsy, may still be as beautiful as a dream, and calling us to the

[1] Borrowed from Mr. Eliot's *Burnt Norton*.

ideal: but can an honest man build his life on dreams? The home of 'lost causes, and forsaken beliefs, and unpopular names, and impossible loyalties' remains an ideal to preserve us from becoming Philistines: but the causes are lost, and the beliefs forsaken; the names unpopular and the loyalties impossible.[1] In this Oxford, as in the idea of the scholar gipsy, the past tantalizes us with its beauty and its hopes: but we know that for all that the past is dead.

The Victorian predicament, in so far as Arnold represents it, was a tragic one—to desire with the heart what was rejected by the head, to need for the spirit what was excluded by the mind. But this is the tradition in which *The Scholar Gipsy* stands. The poem is not conceived, as Mr. Wilson Knight would lead us to believe, in that parallel tradition of Romantic or Christian or Social solutions to the impasse.

II

The first fourteeen stanzas of the poem are on the whole the most memorable, and in these Arnold creates the myth of the gipsy. Analytical intellect is temporarily laid to sleep, but only in order that the myth may be evoked in its own strength to serve the organization of the poem as a whole. There is a dreamlike quality in the verse, in the direct tradition of Keats's *Odes*, and an elegiac note deriving from *Il Penseroso* and Gray's *Elegy*. In the *Ode to a Nightingale* Keats wills his entry into an ideal world ('Away, away, for I will fly to thee'), and re-creates the song of the nightingale as a symbol of eternal beauty. But though the vision is a positive one, it still belongs to poetry, not to life. The word 'forlorn' recalls the poet to reality, to the world

> Where beauty cannot keep her lustrous eyes,
> Nor new love pine at them beyond tomorrow.

The nightingale of the vision can reveal the bitterness of life in time, but cannot provide an escape; it belongs to art, not to life. ('The fancy cannot cheat so well / As she is famed to do, deceiving elf.') The nightingale's song is vital and real as a symbol of what men desire, but has no reality beyond this. Similarly, Keats's Grecian urn has a life and vitality which, since it belongs to art, is more enduring than the experience of men in time: but this is attained only because it is not itself 'alive', and because it is not, outside the world of 'fancy', relevant to those who are. The happy

[1] Compare, for a similar complex of responses, Arnold's words about Newman in the introduction to his American discourse on Emerson, 1883: 'Oxford has more criticism now, more knowledge, more light; but such voices as those of our youth it has no longer. The name of Cardinal Newman is a great name to the imagination still; his genius and his style are still things of power. But he is over eighty years of age; he is in the Oratory at Birmingham; he has adopted, for the doubts and difficulties which beset men's minds today, a solution which, to speak frankly, is impossible.'

lovers will never despair or fade, but neither will they kiss. The urn is a vision of fullness, but at the cost of being also 'Cold pastoral'.

The scholar gipsy is similar in his symbolic function to the nightingale's song and the Grecian urn. He is there to reveal the predicament of man's place in time, the ironic gulf between what man can dream of as possible and what he knows can possibly be. Arnold is no more confused between fact and fiction than Keats was, and to interpret the scholar gipsy as a 'programme' is the most basic mistake that can be made about the poem. The scholar gipsy's uselessness to the nineteenth century on a practical level is underlined, however, by his associations with magic and the pre-scientific world; and as I have suggested, the choice of such a central figure was not made by the poet in any arbitrary spirit.

The gipsy is never seen in the poem by cultured men, or by the dons; he is seen only by shepherds, children, maids dancing at night, simple men bathing on a summer day, the housewife at work, and other unsophisticated observers. It is the simplicity and 'faith' of these observers which enables them to see the gipsy; but the One on the intellectual throne does not see. (The non-readers of *Literature and Dogma*, we might say, see, but not the readers of that work.) The scholar gipsy has, then, the vividness and 'reality' of a child's vision—which is the reality of fancy working upon a consciousness alert and eager, but not the reality of anything apart from that. In st. 1, the evening atmosphere is numinous; in st. 2, the 'bleatings . . . distant cries' and so on are hypnotic, a summer evening's trance, relaxed and contented. In st. 3, the poet himself retires to a place apart, a bower sensuous and secluded where he can daydream. In st. 4, Arnold submits, like the gipsy, to an escape—but still in the mood of an afternoon's diversion. The gipsy escaped because he was 'tired of knocking at Preferment's door', tired of competition, and of the battle of life. He wanted to change his civilized society for a 'natural' or 'wild' one, to change intellect for intuition, the head for the heart. His desire was to roam freely outside the paths of convention, to achieve an integrated life apart from the blight of western culture.

He was, in fact, a primitivist, attempting to realize the myth of the noble savage: seeking eternal fulfilment in a world unoppressed by the pressure of civilization, and hoping that Time itself, man's enemy, could be cheated in this way.

But Arnold, of all men, knew a myth when he saw one. The Churchman who could equate Adam and Eve, and the Incarnation, with Cinderella, was not a man to be taken in by the Noble Savage, or to make such an elementary mistake about Time. His own ideal, as we know, was that of culture, and the scholar gipsy stands at the opposite pole to culture. The gipsy does not, we notice, have either the Hebraic or the Hellenic virtues

as Arnold understood them. He does not combine sweetness with light, but on the contrary, 'does what he likes', and does so in ignorance of the Zeitgeist. He belongs, unmistakably, to innocence, not to experience; to the youth of the world, not to its maturity. He is a creature of superstition and credulity: a kindly creature, not a dark one, it is true, but when all is said, Arnold's own sympathies were with knowledge.

In st. 8 the gipsy is seen on 'retir'd ground'—withdrawn from experience, like the 'youth to fortune and to fame unknown' of Gray's *Elegy*. Then he is seen in 'a pensive dream'. In st. 9 he is part of an enchanted spring evening, in st. 10 he is a midsummer vision. The suggestion of hypnosis is again irresistible, and in the sequence 'river . . . bathing . . . gone' there is more than the hint of a mirage. In st. 11 the uneducated housewife sees him, in st. 12 the animal world. But through this sequence there is a subtle progression from Spring (st. 6), to Summer (st. 8–10), to Autumn (st. 12). Finally, in st. 13, we arrive at Winter, the season of deprivation and death. And it is here that Arnold himself encounters the gipsy. His vision is the Oxford vision; it is a vision of the gipsy battling through snow, rejected from the city, in difficulties, turning away from the city. The gipsy must 'fly our contact' for his safety. There can be no safety for ***him*** in a meeting with the agnostic intellectual who envies him.

In st. 16 the gipsy is again considered in his symbolic role. When contrasted with this symbol, the nineteenth-century losses are severe, but they are beyond remedy—Time and the Zeitgeist are in alliance against the gipsy. The opposite pole of the poem is the One on the intellectual throne, and this is the pole, of course, at which Arnold himself is. Romantics (including the Romantic within) may protest against a devitalized cosmos, but the Highly Serious will be constrained to accept. Despair, however, is not to be escaped, 'For none has hope like thine': and patience, which is the stoic virtue demanded of the disenchanted, is 'too close neighbour of despair'. In st. 20, therefore, the final truth emerges, not explicitly, but in the suggestions of the imagery. The reality of the scholar gipsy is ***death***. He is in a place where there are no more doubts and joy is unclouded, but such a place is only to be equated with non-existence. In st. 14, Arnold has written

> Two hundred years are flown . . .
> And thou from earth art gone
> Long since, and in some quiet churchyard laid—

this being the stanza when he emerges from conscious daydreaming into waking life, before returning to his myth for the second, contemporary part of the poem. His recognition in this stanza of the gipsy's physical death is recalled by the imagery of st. 20—though linked now with the

added, and deeper, suggestion of his death as a symbol also: 'And every doubt long blown by time away. . . .' 'Blown by time away' can suggest only the dust of death—the death of a man ('Imperious Caesar, dead and turned to clay / Might stop a hole to keep the wind away'), and the death of an idea. Death is the gipsy's reality—for Arnold, at least, it is—and that is why the poet meets him in Winter, and meets him as a potential enemy.

And so the poem moves to its last major statement:

> But fly our paths, our feverish contact fly!
> For strong the infection of our mental strife,
> Which, though it gives no bliss, yet spoils for rest;
> And we should win thee from thy own fair life,
> Like us distracted, and like us unblest.
> Soon, soon, thy cheer would die,
> Thy hopes grow timorous, and unfix'd thy powers,
> And thy clear aims be cross and shifting made:
> And then thy glad perennial youth would fade,
> Fade, and grow old at last, and die like ours.

Reading this, the last word before the closing simile, it seems clear enough where Arnold himself, and the age he represented, stands. And since the concreteness of the gipsy's symbolism is behind this stanza, to give precision both to the ideas and to the emotions, the poem in its totality realizes, complexly and poignantly, the tragic impasse of the Victorian age.

In the final stanzas, the Tyrian Trader flees from the Greeks as the scholar gipsy flees before European culture. He flees from the bearers of 'culture' who will find no place for him in the world they are so lightheartedly inaugurating.

When Tennyson's head had assimilated honest doubts to the edge of scepticism, his 'heart stood up and answered "I have felt" '. When Strauss had undermined the historicity of the Bible, he tried to reinstate it as a myth. Matthew Arnold, also, tried to find an emotional cure for the loss of faith. In his case, it took the form of an attempt to substitute culture and poetry for religion, and to find a few axioms that could be made real on the moral pulses. But when it came to the trial, his head gained the day, honesty won the victory over expediency. *The Scholar Gipsy* is a poem of unbelief. Arnold did not discover anything adequate to replace the hopes of the earlier world.

Mr. Wilson Knight himself believes (I take it) in what the scholar gipsy symbolizes, and believes that that is a wisdom both complementary and superior to the 'knowledge' of Oxford. That is, naturally, a possible viewpoint to hold, but I believe that Arnold himself held an opposite one, and that the organization of his poem is essentially part of the Arnold world.

NOTES

RIDICULOSAE STERNUTATIONES

(*o nore* in *Ancrene Wisse*)

A LONG-STANDING puzzle among the superstitions of *lefunge o swefne. o nore. 7 on alle wicchecreftes*[1] was solved when Mr. G. V. Smithers linked the reading *o nore* with *en esternues* in the French text of MS. Cotton Vitellius F VII,[2] and drew attention to early medieval references to augury by sneezing.[3] Two more illustrative passages, from England and closer in date to the *Ancrene Wisse*, may be added. Sneezing as a form of augury is mentioned in Ælfric's homily *De Auguriis*:

> Eall swa gelice se ðe gelyfð wiglungum oððe be fugelum. *oððe be fnorum.* oððe be horsum. oððe be hundum. ne bið hé ná cristen. ac bið forcuð wiðersaca. . . .[4]

Ælfric's source for this section of his homily is a sermon attributed to St. Augustine:

> Illas vero non solum sacrilegas, sed etiam *ridiculosas sternutationes* considerare et observare nolite: sed quoties vobis in quacumque parte fuerit necessitas properandi signate vos in nomine Jesu Christi, et Symbolum vel orationem Dominicam fideliter dicentes, securi de Dei adjutorio iter agite.[5]

Ælfric's treatment of his source allows the inference that augury by sneezing was practised in this country. The sermon is not translated closely, but adapted where English custom had need. For example, divination 'be horsum oððe be hundum' is not mentioned in the Latin work, and Ælfric expands the condemnation of sortilege:

> Hleotan man mot mid geleafan swa þeah on woruldðingum butan wiccecræfte. þæt him deme seota. gif hi hwæt dælan willað. þis nis nan wiglung. ac bið wissung foroft. (p. 370)

[1] MS. C.C.C.C. 402, ed. J. Hall, *Selections from Early Middle English* (Oxford, 1920), i. 54. MS. Cotton Nero A. XIV (E.E.T.S. o.s. 225, p. 92) reads *onore*, or perhaps *on ore*.

[2] Ed. J. A. Herbert (E.E.T.S. o.s. 219), p. 136. Hall (ii. 378) had printed *en estrenies*.

[3] *English and Germanic Studies*, ii (1948–9), 59–60.

[4] *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat (E.E.T.S. o.s. 82), i. 370.

[5] *Sermones Suppositiones*, Migne, *P.L.* 39. 2269. Cf. 'Agustinus se snotera bisceop sæde eac on sumere béc . . .' (Skeat 368), and M. Förster, 'Altenglische Predigtquellen 2. Pseudo-Augustin und Ælfric', *Archiv*, cxvi (1906), 307–8. The Pseudo-Augustine homily used by Ælfric is also the source of that part of the *Homilia de Sacrilegiis* cited by Mr. Smithers (p. 60) as evidence for augury by sneezing (cf. C. P. Caspari, *Homilia de Sacrilegiis* (Christiania, 1886), p. 15, Anm. 10, pp. 63–64). The Pseudo-Augustine work was known to the English Church before the time of Ælfric, for it is quoted in a letter of St. Boniface to Pope Zacharias (*S. Bonfatii et Lulli Epistolae*, ed. M. Tangl, *Mon. Germ. Hist. Epistolae Selectae* (Berlin, 1916), i. 85).

Also, the latter part of Ælfric's homily, which is not derived from the same source, suggests that as a whole it is directed against existing superstitions and customs, and that anything mentioned, even if found in the Pseudo-Augustine source, is likely to have been practised in England.[1]

The second passage is from the *Summa de Casibus* of Thomas de Chabham. After mention of abortion, infanticide, sortilege,[2] and love potions there is the following passage:

> Sunt autem quedam summo opere intelligenda sacerdotibus ut parochianos suos admoneant ne sortilegiis et veneficiis supradictis se inmisceant, quia pauci sunt viri vel mulieres qui aliquocies predictorum generum peste non sunt inquinati. Quidam enim si quosdam sibi obvios habuerint futuros eventus inde sibi pronosticant. *Alii si surgentes sternutaverint bonum vel malum inde sibi credunt futurum.* Alii ex planctu ululatu nocturno, sive ex ululatu canum, pestem vel mortem domini sui credunt futuram.[3]

Such references to sneezing superstitions may have been commonplace in penitential literature, since they are mentioned in the *Decretum* C. XXVI, q. 2, c. vi: 'redire ad lectum, si quis, dum se calciat, sternutauerit.'[4]

Another roughly contemporary illustration comes from a fragment about a journey in the *Black Book of Carmarthen*, f. 41^{v} (late 12th–early 13th century):

[1] The homily mentions such sins as abortion, infanticide, the taking of love potions, and drawing children through the earth at cross-roads (p. 374); these practices, except the last, can be paralleled in most of the penitentials in use in England (see F. W. H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche* (Halle, 1851), H. J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche* (Mainz, 1883–98), and J. T. MacNeill and H. M. Gamer, *Medieval Handbooks of Penance* (New York, 1938)). The penitential known as Pseudo-Ecgbert's provides a very close parallel to the passage in Ælfric's homily, and apparently the only English parallel to the drawing of children through the earth (*Die altenglische Version des Halitgar'schen Bussbuches* (*sog. Poenitentiale Pseudo-Ecgberti*), ed. J. Raith, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, xiii (Hamburg, 1933), 53–55).

[2] Cf. the whole passage in the *Ancrene Wisse* (Hall, i. 54) in which the mention of superstitions occurs. Some of the illustrations of the Capital sins (e.g. ll. 21–24) are remarkable in an instruction intended for *inclusae*, and the passage recalls the detailed instructions on confession contained in Part v 'of schrifte', which 'limpeð to alle men iliche. Vor þi ne awundri ȝe nout. þet ich touward ou. nomeliche nabbe nout ispeken i þisse dole. habbeð þauh to ower bihoue: þesne lutle laste ende' (MS. Nero, E.E.T.S. edn., p. 155). On the place of the *Ancrene Riwle* amongst English works treating of penance, see E. J. Arnould, *Le Manuel des péchés* (Paris, 1940), pp. 38, 224; C. Kirchberger, 'Some Notes on the *Ancrene Riwle*', *Dominican Studies*, vii (1954), 230–5; and G. Sitwell's introduction to *The Ancrene Riwle*, trs. M. B. Salu (London, 1955), pp. xviii–xxi.

[3] MS. Oriel College Oxford 17 f. 100. I am grateful to the Rev. L. Boyle, O.P., for drawing my attention to this passage. On Thomas de Chabham see C. R. Cheney, *English Synodalia of the Thirteenth Century* (London, 1941), p. 54, and J. C. Russell, *Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England* (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Special Supplement No. 3, 1936). Fr. Boyle dates the *Summa de Casibus* c. 1217–22.

[4] *Corpus Juris Canonici*, ed. A. Friedberg (Leipzig, 1879), i. 1022. The passage is in an excerpt from St. Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*, II, c. XX (Migne *P.L.* XXXIV. 50).

Under the protection of my lord do I dress
today. I hear one sneeze—
that is not my God; I do not believe in it.

I dress myself handsomely.
I do not believe the omen because it is not true.
He who created me will strengthen me.[1]

II

Mr. Smithers's linguistic explanation of the form *nore* referred to ON. *hnøri, hneri* 'a sneeze', and suggested that 'the ME. word derives either from a prehistoric ON. **hnora* . . . or (more probably) from an unmutated form adopted from Danes or Norwegians in the West of England. R-mutation lapsed or was set aside by analogy in East Norse and to some extent in Old Norwegian' (p. 59). This linguistic explanation may be the right one, but before it can be accepted finally the seeming traces of a native unmutated *hnora* should be noticed.

The form *huora* glosses *sternutatio* in the Erfurt Glossary,[2] and *nor* occurs as a gloss to 'sternutatio eius splendor ignis' (Job xli. 9) in the Leiden Glossary.[3] The first form, emended to *hnora*, is included in Holthausen's *Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, and the second was taken as representing **hnor* by Hessels, who cited the Erfurt form *huora* and derived both from 'an unrecorded AS. strong verb **hnēosan* (equivalent to Norse *hnjōsa*), a parallel imitative form of *fnēosan* (whence *fnora* etc.)'.[4]

If *hnora* and (*h*)*nor* are genuine OE. forms, the position in OE. seems to have been like that in ON., where *fnasa, fnysa* 'to sneeze' and *fnasan* ' a sneeze' are recorded beside *hnerra, hnjosa* 'to sneeze' and *hnori, hneri* 'a sneeze' (Cleasby-Vigfusson, *Icelandic–English Dictionary*, s. vv.). Old English may have had similar variation between *fneosan, fnesan*, and **hneosan, fnora, fneosung*, and *h*[*n*]*ora*. ME. and early ModE. *nesen, neese* point back to such forms as easily as to ON. influence, and it is worth notice that *neeze* is recorded in the *English Dialect Dictionary* not

[1] Ar helv uy ren y guiscaw
hetiu. un trev a glyuaw.
nid ew wy duu nis credaw.

Guiscaw ymdanaw inberth.
ny credaw coel canyd kerth
y gur am creuyse am nerth.

I am grateful to Professor I. Ll. Foster for the reference and his translation.

[2] H. Sweet, *The Oldest English Texts*, p. 94/888. Cf. *fnora* in Epinal and Corpus (ibid. and 99/1909).

[3] Sweet, *O.E.T.*, p. 113/60.

[4] *A late Eighth-century Latin–Anglo-Saxon Glossary* (Cambridge, 1906), pp. 197, 233. Clark Hall, *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, includes the form *hnor* (?).

only in the north but also in Devon and Shropshire. The accumulation of Erfurt and Leiden *huora* and *nor*, *nore* in the *Ancrene Wisse*, late ME. *nesen* and early ModE. *neese* suggests that the consonant variation *fn-*/*hn-* in the word 'sneeze' may have been native.

It is uncertain, however, whether the Erfurt and Leiden spellings represent OE. or OHG. pronunciation of the initial consonant. Both manuscripts were written by German scribes and contain a number of OHG. forms.[1] The OHG. cognates of OE. *fneosan*, *fneosung* are **niosan* (*niusit*) *niosunga* representing earlier **hniosan* **hniosunga*,[2] and the Leiden form *nor* is included together with *nur* as an OHG. gloss on *sternutatio* by Steinmeyer and Sievers.[3] OHG. loss of initial *h* before *l*, *n*, *r*, *w* seems to have been earlier (9th century)[4] than the similar change before *l*, *n*, *r* in late OE.,[5] and the Leiden form seems certainly to be an accommodation of either OE. *fnor*(*a*) or *hnor*(*a*).

Nevertheless the OHG. cognates do not disprove the existence of an *hn*-variant in OE. *H* before a consonant is omitted at least twice in the Erfurt Glossary 'probably from German analogies': (*h*)*raen* 400 *uuidir*-(*h*)*linienti* 537.[6] The mis-writing *huora* probably means that the word was not recognized by the scribe, and therefore that the *hn*- was not an accommodation of OE. *fn*- at the time the Erfurt glossary was written. *H* was probably in its exemplar, whether this was English or an intermediate German copy; *huora* may therefore disguise the form of the OE. archetype.

The difference in ending between the Leiden and Erfurt forms is inconclusive. Similar weak and strong noun formations are found both in OE. and OHG. *H*[*n*]*ora* corresponds with OE. *fnora* but could be an OHG. weak feminine or neuter noun. *Nor* corresponds with OE. *lor*, *flot* (cf. *gebod*, *gesod*), but also with OHG. *bot* (cf. *gibot*, *virlor*, &c.).[7]

Modern dialect *nor* 'snore' recorded in the *English Dialect Dictionary* for the Orkneys and Shetlands is likely, if genuine, to be of ON. origin. The form is not recorded by Jakobsen (*An Etymological Dictionary of the Norn Language in Shetland*, London and Copenhagen, 1928–32), nor by Marwick (*The Orkney Norn*, London, 1929). JOY RUSSELL-SMITH

[1] Sweet, *O.E.T.*, pp. 4, 5.

[2] W. Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* (8th edn., Tübingen, 1953), § 334, Anm. 2.

[3] *Die althochdeutschen Glossen* (Berlin, 1879–1922), i. 497/17.

[4] Braune, § 153.

[5] The earliest spelling cited in Sievers-Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik* (Halle, 1951), § 217, Anm. 2, is *neappian* from the Vespasian Psalter gloss. The Leiden Glossary was dated by Hessels as late eighth century (p. xiii), and by Lindsay 'saec. viii' (*Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 460).

[6] Sweet, *O.E.T.*, p. 26.

[7] For material on related noun and verb formations in OHG. see W. Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik* (Strasbourg, 1893–1906), ii. 183 ff.

THE MUSICAL STUDIES OF A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY WOOL MERCHANT

AMONG the papers of the Cely family in the Public Record Office, sandwiched between household accounts, business memoranda, and bills of lading for sarplers of wool, there is a particularly interesting booklet recording some of George Cely's personal expenses in 1473–5. Three pages contain a list of his payments for music and dancing lessons at Calais. This would be valuable for the fact alone that nowhere else in the Cely papers is there any suggestion of such activities, apart from a payment of 4*d.* to a minstrel at Boulogne when ten Staplers made a trip there from Calais,[1] and the implications of another document which will be discussed presently. In addition, however, the list mentions the incipits of three or four apparently unknown songs, and gives, considering its nature and brevity, a remarkable picture of the musical interests of a young man of middle-class family, and an indication of some of the gaiety which caused Sir John Paston to describe Calais at this time as 'a merry town'.[2]

The lessons were from Thomas Rede, harper at Calais, where George Cely was in business as a member of the Staple Company. There are payments for instruction in playing a total of forty dances: twenty-six on the harp and fourteen apparently on the lute, together with a hornpipe. A year later there is a refresher course 'for to amend all my dances again'. George also learned dancing, for which he purchased 'bills of footing', presumably, that is, papers setting out the steps of a dance as in the appendix to Michel Toulouze's book on base dancing.[3] A distinction seems to be made between 'dancing' and 'base dances'. He further had practice in harp and lute playing, bought a harp and a paper of instructions for tuning the lute, and learned alternative ways of tuning his harp, while payments to Rede are recorded for stringing a double harp, for resin, and for pinning and dressing the harp. In addition to the dances George learned seven songs: *O Freshest Flower*, *Toujours* (?), *O Rosa Bella*, *Mine Heart's Lust*, *Of Such Complain*, *Go Heart Hurt with Adversity*, and *My Daily* (or ? *Doly* 'sorrowful') *Woe*.

The following is the full text, which occupies ff. 3, 3^{v}, and 4 of a long narrow booklet of twelve pages (P.R.O. C.47/37/11, ff. 1–5). I have expanded abbreviations, capitalized proper names, and introduced some punctuation.

[1] P.R.O. C. 47/37/16, f. 19.

[2] I am greatly indebted to Mr. Denis Stevens for his help on several musical points, and in endeavouring to trace these four incipits. I should also like to acknowledge some suggestions, which have been incorporated in the text, from Dr. E. A. Sheppard of Auckland University College, and comments on the French document from Mr. F. J. Warne of the University of Bristol.

[3] Michel Toulouze, *Lart et Instruction de bien dancer* (Paris, before 1496, ?1488). Facsimile edition by Victor Scholderer for the Royal College of Physicians, 1936.

Anno lxxiiij.

Memorandum that her afftyr ffollowys by dywars passellys what Thomas Rede harpar at Calles hathe hadde off me, anno vt sopra.

Item the x day off Marche anno lxxiij payd ffor vj davnsys and myne fyngyryng on the harpe ix s. . . . . ix s.

Item the xiiij day off Jovne yt cost me to the sayd Thomas ffor to lerne to davnsse . . . . . vj s. viij d.

Item payd ffor my byll off fotyng[1] . . . . . iiij d.

Item lent to the sayd Thomas appon an harpe, ix s. . . . ix s.

Item payd to thurde dayo Septembyr ffor davnsyng . . . . ij s.

Anno lxxiiij.

Item the xxij day off Octobyr I payd vn to the sayd Thomas ffor to lerne to harpe xx davnsys . . . . . vij s.

Item the ffurst day off Novembyr I payd vn to the sayd Thomas ffor to lerne xiiij davnsys and an horne pype on the levt . . . . . iiij s. x d.

Item the xiiij day off Novembyr payd to the sayd Thomas ffor a byll ffor to lerne to tevne the levte . . . . . iij s. vj d.

Item the xxv day off Decembyr payd to the sayd Thomas ffor to lerne O ffresshes Flour/ tos Juirs[2]/ o Rosse Abella . . . . . iij s. vjd.

[*In different ink and written later*]: Sum pag. . . . . xlv s. vj d.

Anno lxxiiij.

Item the xvij day off Decembyr payd to Thomas Rede ffor myne fyngyryng and ffor myne tastyng[3] off the harpe and ffor myne hartys luste and Offreschys fflour ij ⌜whayys⌝[4] . . . . . v s.

Item payd a plake a wheke at dywars tymys . . . iij s. iiij d.

Sum totall that had off me at dywars tymys . . . . [*blank*]

Sum totall that Y hawe layd [owte] off othyr thyngys as whe[ll] as thys . . .

[*Later entry in different ink*]:

Item yn Octobyr anno lxxv payd by me George Cely vn to Thomas Rede harpar ffor lernyng me off seche cvm playn iij whayes, and ffor to amende all my davnsys a ȝen—iij s. iiij d. . . . . iij s. [iiij d.]

Item payd by me George Cely vn to the sayde Thomas Rede ffor to teke me to sett my harppe an nothyr way and ffor to teche me all my davnsys that same way . . . . . iiij s.

[1] *Footing* 'dancing', first cited in *O.E.D.* from 1561.

[2] The *s* in *tos* is a boldly formed long *s*, of a type quite unusual in a final position in this hand, which might lead to the supposition that it is intended for the abbreviation *ser*, although no cross stroke through the tail is visible. It is thus just conceivable that 'to *ser* Juoris' (i.e. 'To Sir Joris') may be the real title. The third letter of the second word may be a badly formed *r*, not an *i*, with a faint superior *r* added for clarity.

[3] The first citation in *O.E.D.* of *Taste* v. 'to feel, handle' applied to the playing of a musical instrument is from Crashaw, 1648.

[4] 'Two ways'. This probably refers to the tuning of the harp, as does the later reference to setting the harp 'another way'.

Item payd vn to the sayd Thomas ffor to lerne me an song ys callyd go hertt [hurt] wyth athewersyte . . . . . xx d.

Item payd be me vn to Thomas Rede ffor an lytyll ffyngyr hyng [o]n the lewte xvj d. . . . . xvj d.

f. 4 Item payd to Thomas Rede ffor my dely wo [wo *repeated and crossed out*] and ffor my byll off ffottyng off baȝ davnssys[1] v s. iiij d. . . v s. iiij d.

Item payd vn to the sayd Thomas Rede ffor stryngyng off an dobyll harpp and ffor bray pynnyng and dressyng[2]. . . . . iij s. iiij d.

Three of the songs here mentioned are well known. *O Rosa Bella*, the music of which is attributed to Dunstable and the words to the Italian Leonardo Giustiniani, exists in seventeen manuscript versions.[3] Its first two lines run

O Rosa Bella, O dolce anima mia,
Non mi lassar morire In cortesia.

Myne Hartys Luste is presumably the song *Myn Hertes Lust, Sterre of my Confort* in one 8-line stanza with music in a Yale University Chansonnier.[4]

Go Hertt Hurt wyth Athewersyte [adversity] is easily accessible in Robbins, *Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries* (Oxford, 2nd edn. 1955), no. 155 (from Bodleian MS. Ashmole 191, f. 192^{v}), and, with music and rather differently spelled, in John Harvey's *Gothic England* (London, 1947), p. 85.

O Fresshes Flour, on the other hand, does not seem to correspond to any of the poems in the *Index of Middle English Verse*. *O Fresch floure, most plesant of pryse* (Robbins, no. 209) is a long mocking poem, unsuitable for a song, and *Now fresshe floure, to me that ys so bryght* (ibid., no. 138) has thirteen verses and is rather learned in type.

Tos Juirs, as already indicated, is something of a guess. 'Toujours' is a very likely incipit, and George Cely is fully capable of such a spelling, but it is impossible to identify a title consisting of a single word as common as this. There are, for instance, two songs beginning *Toujours—Toujours bien* and *Toujours me souviendra* (beside *Il est toujours*, *Per faire toujours* and

[1] i.e. base dances.

[2] *A dobyll harpp*: earlier by four centuries than *O.E.D.*'s first citation of *Double* 'sounding an octave lower' as applied to an instrument, although 'double notes' is given for 1674.

Bray: 'resin', Fr. *brai*. *O.E.D.* gives only *Bray* v.[3] 'rare' (from Hakluyt in the sense 'to pitch a ship').

Pynnyng: 'fitting with tuning pegs' or 'adjusting the pegs of': *O.E.D. Pin* sb.[1] 1d, 'the tuning peg of a stringed musical instrument', first quotation from Greene, 1587.

[3] Edited by M. Bukofzer in *Musica Britannica*, viii (London, 1953).

[4] No. 2183 in Carleton Brown and R. H. Robbins, *Index of Middle English Verse*. Mr. Stevens has pointed out to me rather similar words in a song by William Cornish (*c.* 1500), *Adew Adew my hartis lust*, in B.M. Add. MS. 31922.

Biaulx parlé toujours)—among twenty ascribed to J. Martini, who was possibly of Flemish origin, and was flourishing in Italy *c.* 1474–92.[1]

Off Seche Cvmplayn (? 'Of Such Complaint') seems to have disappeared, and so does *My Dely Wo*, in which *dely* may represent either a 'bad' spelling of *daily* or be an unrecorded form *dely* 'sorrowful'; cf. *O.E.D.* under *Doly* a. (Sc. 16th-cent. *duillie*, 18th-cent. *dooly*) and *Dole*, *dool*, *dule*, sb.[2] (14th–15th-cent. *deel*, *dele*, *deyl*(*le*), &c.), whence *delful*(*ly*), var. of *dole-ful*(*ly*).

The fees paid seem comparatively high: 3*s.* 6*d.* for three songs would compare with such costs as 3*s.* 4*d.* for a calf, 2*s.* 4*d.* for a hat and hat-band, 16*s.* for a hawk or a gown, 3*s.* 4*d.* for a week's board and lodging at Calais, and 2*d.* for a servant's dinner in London. But the younger Celys and their circle were apparently willing to pay high prices for their luxuries while grumbling about other expenses such as legal and funeral costs. One entry seems to indicate that Rede was sometimes paid at a flat rate of a plack a week—the plack was a small coin of Brabant worth about 2½*d.* sterling ('the old plack') or 8*d.* ('the new plack') at contemporary rates.

A combined singing and French lesson is suggested by some jottings on the back of a business letter sent to George Cely at Bergen-op-Zoom on 28 April ?1479.[2] George is known to have had a French-speaking mistress at Calais about this date—'my lady Clare', whose avowal of love is extant among the rest of the Cely correspondence—and the fact that the adjective *hovntesse* 'honteuse' is in the feminine suggests that she, or another lady, was the mentor on this occasion. N.E. French dialectal forms are prominent, especially in the diphthongs. The jottings, which are scattered at various angles around the address on the dorse of the letter, run

⟨Je nott Je boy a voȝe *cancelled*⟩

Je boy Avous mademoyselle / Je vous playe movnsenyuevr // porsse ke vous I estes se belle / Je boy &c. ⟨Je ssue sseur (?) *cancelled*⟩ Je sens lamor (?) rensson estynselle Ke me persse par me le kowre / Je boy [&c][3]

Je voue pleye mo.nsenyewr // de davns wᵗ in de horsse / wᵗhov[te]
Bosonye / besy // shavnte // syng /// Vn shavnssovne / an song lere / Rede

Vn shen an doge /
shovtt hott ffrett covld

Je le vous hay de kavnt je Raye / I have sayd yow whan I go // Je swy hovntesse / shamed
Je swy hovntesse // I am shamyd.

[1] Oscar Chilesotti, 'Toujours Bien di Jo. Martini', *Revista Musicale Italiana*, xxiii (1916), 66–69, and G. Reese, *Music in the Renaissance* (London, 1954), pp. 220–2.

[2] P.R.O. S.C. I. lix. 19.

[3] MS. slightly torn on right margin.

The first seven phrases, separated in the original by oblique strokes as shown, seem to be the text of a song, which would be, transcribed into modern French,

Je bois à vous, mademoiselle.
Je vous plais, monseigneur?
Pour ce que vous êtes si belle
Je bois [à vous, mademoiselle.]
Je sens l'amour en son étincelle
Qui me perce parmi le coeur.
Je bois [à vous mademoiselle.]
Je vous plais, monseigneur?

The reading of the fifth line is doubtful, and the interpretation given does not make very good sense, besides adding an unwanted syllable; but it is the best that I can furnish.

Of some incidental interest, perhaps, is one piece of ungrammatical doggerel which appears in George Cely's writing on a page of random scribbles in the miscellaneous papers.[1] It may be George's own effort, although plenty of contemporary writing expresses similar improving sentiments, and many are in scarcely better verse. The subject apparently changes abruptly in the third line:

To sorow in the mornyng
And howr hewe spend thy good
Yff a sorowyd howyr hewyn
[A]s he in the mornyng cott
Many showlld ryde an horsse bake
That now goysse an ffotte.

As a rough translation might be suggested: 'To waste thy substance at night[2] and repent in the morning. If he sorrowed at eve as he does [*cott* 'could'?] in the morning, many a man would ride on horseback who now goes on foot'.

ALISON HANHAM

[1] P.R.O. C.47/37/12, f. 32v.
[2] *O.E.D. Over eve* 'on the preceding night'.

SIR JOHN HAYWARD AND TACITUS

MR. S. L. GOLDBERG's article, 'Sir John Hayward, "Politic" Historian' (*R.E.S.*, N.S. vi (1955), 233–44), calls attention—rightly, I believe—to Hayward's importance in introducing into England the ideas and methods of the 'politic' history stemming from Machiavelli and Guicciardini. Some years ago, in a study I made of Hayward's *Henry IV*, several borrowings turned up that add further documentation to Mr. Goldberg's conclusions.

First, the comment on Richard's banishing of Bolingbroke. Hayward says that Richard would have done better to have either killed the king or pardoned him completely, and he cites the example of the error of the Samnites at the Caudine Forks. This seems to come directly from Machiavelli's *Discourses*,[1] though for a book so widely read there is the possibility of an intermediate source. Second, the Bishop of Carlisle's speech, which is several pages in length, is a direct translation of the part of Bodin's *Republic* that distinguishes between elective and hereditary monarchy.[2]

The most curious feature of the work is phrase after phrase taken from Sir Henry Savile's translations of Tacitus's *Histories* and *Life of Agricola* and Savile's *The Ende of Nero and the Beginning of Galba*, with which he filled in the gap between the *Annals* and *Histories*. It is impossible to repeat them all here, for a complete list would run to ten or a dozen pages. Hayward apparently did not use Greenway.

In general the borrowings are what might be expected, political aphorisms and maxims used to interpret and clarify the events of Richard's reign.[3] Sometimes a broader historical parallel is suggested; Richard's troubles with the wild Irish, for instance, consistently echo the parts of the *Agricola* describing Roman attempts to 'civilize' the barbarous British.[4] Or again, the 'steaks and slivers' of Tacitus are merely rhetorical ornamentation, as in the battle scenes or the short epigrammatic characters.[5] Like most Renaissance historians Hayward has little sense of historical relativism, and to the modern reader there is something incongruous

[1] John Hayward, *The First Part of the Life and Reigne of Henrie IIII* (London, 1599), pp. 49–50. Machiavelli, *Discourses*, ii. 13.

[2] Jean Bodin, *Six livres de la Republique*, ii. 5.

[3] A list follows of pages on which parallel passages can be found. The references to Savile are to Henry Savile, *The Ende of Nero and the Beginning of Galba*, tr. Caius Cornelius Tacitus, *Foure Bookes of the Histories. . ., The Life of Agricola* (London, 1598). Savile, p. 165, Hayward, pp. 1–2; S. 137, H. 135; S. 199–200, H. 12, 54; S. 201, H. 50, 52; S. 6, H. 59; S. 2, 1, 2, 17, H. 64, 65, 66, 67–68.

[4] S. 190, 191, 192–3, 194, 196, 189; H. 56, 57, 58, 60.

[5] Battle scenes: S. 135–6, H. 31; S. 110–1, H. 142; S. 131, H. 148. Characters: S. 1, H. 4; S. 139, H. 130.

about applying to the feudal squabbles of the fourteenth century the political wisdom of the sixteenth, itself drawn from a study of the early days of the Roman empire.

In drawing on Tacitus as well as Machiavelli and Bodin, Hayward was aligning himself with fashionable opinion of his day.[1] As Boccalini says, Tacitus is 'the Arch-Flamen of Modern Policy', 'now so frequently handled by all men, as Shop-Keepers and Porters, seem to understand nothing better than Reason of State'.[2] Did Hayward have another motive? One wonders if familiarity with Tacitus was not a trademark of the Essex circle. Essex himself was popularly supposed to have written the preface to Sir Henry Savile's translation,[3] and at the time of the Essex trial Sir Henry was considered enough of a friend of Essex to be imprisoned briefly. In a letter written as he was leaving for Ireland Essex quotes Tacitus,[4] and in the account of the Essex plot and trial given by Camden the language is distinctly Tacitean, Essex at one time being compared to Germanicus.[5] The evidence is hardly conclusive, but it is possible that Hayward was trying to recommend himself by using the language of a clique. At any rate he had leisure enough to repent of his 'felony', for whatever his intention may have been it cost him nearly three years' imprisonment.

EDWIN B. BENJAMIN

[1] See Giuseppe Toffanin, *Machiavelli e il Tacitismo* (Padova, 1921).

[2] Henry Cary, Earl of Monmouth, tr. Trajano Bocalini [*sic*], *Advertisements from Parnassus* (London, 1674), p. 115. See also Jonson's poem *The New Crie* (1616) (*Poems*, ed. Bernard Newdigate (Oxford, 1936) pp. 39–40):

> They are the almanacks
> For twelve yeares yet to come, what each state lacks.
> They carry in their pockets Tacitus.

[3] Israel Gollancz ('Ben Jonson and the Elizabethan Tacitus', *T.L.S.*, 10 May 1928, p. 355) suggests Anna Barnes.

[4] Edwin A. Abbott, *Bacon and Essex* (London, 1877), p. 110: 'I am not ignorant what are the disadvantages of absence, the opportunities of practising enemies, when they are neither encountered or overlooked, the construction of Princes under whom *magna spes* is more dangerous than *mala* and *successius nimius quam nullus*. . . .' Cf. S. 199–200, H. 12, 54. In another letter (Abbott, p. 114) Essex compares the English conquests of Ireland with the Roman conquests of Britain.

[5] R. N. tr. William Camden, *Annals or, the History of the most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth* (London, 1635). Camden makes the point (p. 532) that Essex's own great abilities are dangerous to him: 'That nothing gaue more courage to the enemy, than if those men should be dealt hardly withall, which were eminent aboue the rest, and were accompted harmlesse. That hee had not any more deadly enemies, than (as was said in old time of *Germanicus*,) his own ornaments; and that those which were his aduersaries, had nothing to complaine of him more than his greatnesse.' There is a general atmosphere of plotting and intrigue about Camden's whole account of the Essex conspiracy that is decidedly Tacitean, e.g. p. 536: 'Hereupon he harkening to sinister Counsellors, began secretly to hammer anew those clandestine designes undertaken in *Ireland*, for the removing of his adversaries from the Court.'

REVIEWS

Language and Literature of the Anglo-Saxon Nations as presented in German Doctoral Dissertations 1885–1950. A Bibliography. By RICHARD MUMMENDEY. Pp. xvi + 200. Bonn: Bouvier; Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1954. DM. 25; £4. 4s.

The present book, compiled by a librarian, is an attempt at bringing together German doctoral dissertations in the field of English language and literature. There are 2,989 items, which are numbered consecutively, followed by an index of authors and subjects. The first part of the book listing studies in the field of English language (pp. 3–38) is arranged under the headings General Studies, Phonetics, Phonology, Spelling, Morphology, Etymology (Vocabulary), Syntax, Dialect and Slang, Style, and Prosody, and with the exception of the last two items these sections are subdivided into Old English, Middle English, and modern periods. The second part, which deals with literature (pp. 41–154), has initial chapters where dissertations on more general topics (History of Genres, History of Ideas) are listed; but from No. 763 the author has arranged his material in chronological order, dividing it up into sections on Old English, religious and secular poetry of the Middle Ages, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Renaissance and Reformation, &c., and the literature of the Commonwealth and America.

A reference book of this kind, which appears to be the first systematic compilation of German doctoral dissertations on English language and literature, should be welcome to scholars, provided it is accurate, reliable, and complete. But the usefulness of this work is greatly limited by omissions and slips of one kind and another. After checking Mummendey's material with 482 items listed in a catalogue of dissertations of the English departmental library in the Free University of Berlin it was found that sixty-four (!) were missing in his index; yet according to the terms of reference stated on p. viii they were all books which ought to have been included. The following three dissertations may serve as examples: O. Funke, *Kasussyntax bei Orrm und Layamon* (Munich, 1908); H. Heuer, *Romaneske Elemente im Realismus von Charles Dickens* (Marburg, 1927); E. T. Sehrt, *Geschichtliches und religiöses Denken bei Thomas de Quincey (1785–1859)* (Freiburg, 1936). It should have been easy to discover these items because the authors are professors of English in Berne, Freiburg, and Göttingen. Apart from such gaps even a casual examination of the index reveals such misprints as 'Koelbling' for 'Koelbing', 'Knoreck' for 'Korreck', 'Siemering' for 'Siemerling', 'Volquarth' for 'Volquartz', &c. Again, the translation of the German preface does little credit to the author's command of English and ought not to have been printed in this form in a scholarly publication. This might also be said of the manner in which certain German terms are rendered into English. 'Anglistics' (p. ix) is less familiar to an English reader than 'English language and literature'; 'Wortlehre' and 'etymology' (p. 21) are not identical; 'literary

science' (p. 39) is unidiomatic; 'Restauration' should be 'Restoration' (p. 93); and whilst 'Theaterwissenschaft', the heading used for studies on the history of the theatre, is a current and intelligible term in Germany, few English readers will make head or tail of 'theatrical science' (p. 153). It is regrettable that so little care has been bestowed on what otherwise might have been a useful work of reference.

BOGISLAV VON LINDHEIM

Devotional Pieces in Verse and Prose. Edited by J. A. W. BENNETT. Pp. xxxviii + 350 (Scottish Text Society, Third Series 23). Edinburgh: Blackwood, for the Society, 1955. Available from the Secretary.

Dr. Bennett has edited the contents of MSS. Arundel 285 and Harleian 6919, not all of which have previously been printed, two vernacular books of devotion of early sixteenth-century character. There is *The Passion of Christ*, ascribed to Walter Kennedy, and *The Contemplation of Sinners*, by William Tours, a Scottish Minorite who may have been a student in Paris in the 1470's, as well as a version of the *XV O's*, usually though falsely attributed in the fifteenth century to St. Bridget of Sweden, and, among other items, a set of prayers in honour of the Crown of Thorns for which even Dr. Bennett has not been able to find sources or parallels. Both manuscripts are late Middle Scots in dialect, although Kennedy at least employed for poetic purposes a somewhat free mixture of sounds and forms: thus, *mair / pair*, *sair / haire* rhymes are found together with *glore / more* (twice). A point of linguistic interest is that in the Crown of Thorns prayers Christ is throughout addressed in the polite plural, contrary to all liturgical usage, and perhaps indicative of the French or Dutch influences to be seen elsewhere in these manuals. The Arundel scribe has been in places both inattentive and stupid, constantly transposing lines, spoiling rhymes, leaving out vital words: it may be because of his carelessness or just possibly because a leaf is missing between ff. 94 and 95 that the prefatory rubric to the Crown of Thorns prayers, which manifestly intends to state the indulgences which are to be gained by their recitation, is left unfinished. Dr. Bennett has had much to do to correct where that is possible such errors; he has exercised admirable care and ingenuity in his work, and only a few minor errors seem to have found their way into his text. On p. 1, l. 4, *meik* should read *meike*; and, since *Conmone* or *Conmoue* is emended to *Commone* (21.416), a similar footnote should have been furnished for *commonly* (9.57), where also a minim is wanting.

The *Passion of Christ* in particular is very typical of 'transitional' religious poetry, written at inordinate length with that disengaged facility which is so disagreeable a characteristic of the fifteenth-century minor poets, and employing imagery which often betrays the mere dilettante. Such flights of fancy as the introduction, among the Deadly Sins who preside at the Passion, of 'King Cupid', and Kennedy's lavish use of the modish 'aureate terms', produce an effect comparable with those Gothic churches in Germany and Switzerland which were 'done over' in the eighteenth century and tricked out with Baroque statuary and ornaments. Every man to his taste, of course: and it would be surprising if Scotland in this era had not been strongly influenced by French and other

continental arbiters. That such influence was at work upon Scottish devotional literature and art is best shown by the illustrations to these two manuscripts, upon which Dr. Bennett has spent much care. The pictures which illustrate *The Contemplation of Sinners* in the Harley manuscript are for the first time reproduced: they are clearly an amateur's copies or imitations of German or Dutch work of the early Renaissance. It is a pity that not more of the Arundel illustrations could have been given, for these consist of woodcuts pasted in, few if any of them insular work, and mostly strongly medieval in character. Particularly interesting are the three quite different treatments of 'Anna Selbdritt' on ff. 189^{v}, 190^{v}, and 208^{v}. The editor has identified the first of these as an Antwerp print of *c.* 1510: and the whole series forms an important witness to the manner in which foreign devotional art was used and studied at this time. If sources are presently found for the Crown of Thorns devotions, perhaps the most interesting single item in this edition, it may well be that they too will lead to the Low Countries or the Rhineland. As it is, we should be grateful to Dr. Bennett for the enterprise and assiduity which has resulted in this admirable edition, throwing light on a subject about which most of us, south of the Border at least, are lamentably ignorant.

ERIC COLLEDGE

Bibliography of Medieval Drama. By CARL J. STRATMAN, C.S.V. Pp. x+424. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. 37*s.* 6*d.* net.

On this occasion, at least, the reviewer is not prepared to dispute the author's claim, modestly expressed, that his book is filling a long-felt want. No one who has worked at all systematically on medieval drama can have failed to be irritated at the lack of a reliable guide to the literature of the subject, and now that there appears to be a resurgence of interest in it (although surprisingly enough many of the fundamental tasks of scholarship, including the provision of reliable versions of major texts, remain untouched) Father Stratman deserves to expect nothing but our gratitude for the completion of a truly heroic enterprise.

His volume of almost four thousand entries is divided into twelve major sections, covering general works, bibliographies, and collections of plays, English, French, German, Italian, Latin, Spanish, and Byzantine drama, and the plays of Hrotswitha. It is inevitable that such a volume of material should present considerable difficulties of arrangement, but the methods used are clearly explained in the introduction and seem to be successful. A number of unpublished dissertations have been included where these seem to be valuable, and also a number of reviews of major works published after 1900 when these have aroused controversy. Library symbols, for assistance in the location of copies, have been given for about 90 per cent. of the book entries, although of necessity, except for early editions of individual plays, these have had to be confined to libraries in Canada and the United States. Two appendixes and an index, which are of great assistance in using the work, complete this very valuable contribution to medieval studies.

When reviewing a bibliography the great temptation for the reviewer is to score off the author by discovering omissions. In the present case he is to some extent disarmed by Father Stratman's statement that his work 'does not pretend to be exhaustive in any sense of the term' and he must accept this limitation to his fault-finding proclivities. Nevertheless, attention should be drawn to a few items of some importance which might find a place in the supplements which Father Stratman surely intends to issue from time to time (for it would be a great pity not to keep so valuable a piece of work up to date and as complete as possible). Entry 49a, for example, a list of Malone Society Reprints, might include *Wily Beguiled*, *Wit and Science*, *Trial and Flagellation*, and *Gentleness and Nobility* (the last two omissions being possibly errors of cross-reference). The first volume of the Malone Society's *Collections* could well be added to the section on Robin Hood plays. To the section on pageantry may be added A. H. Smith's article on a York pageant of 1486 in *London Medieval Studies*, I. iii (1948 for 1939). An examination of *Folk-Lore* (London) reveals a number of items omitted from the section on Folk Drama; it would be tedious to list them here, but in view of Father Stratman's item 1542 (concerned with Elizabethan and Jacobean material) it is perhaps not out of place to mention John Crow's article of a similar nature in *Folk-Lore*, September 1947. The apparent omission of a number of more recent important books and articles is perhaps accounted for by the delay which must have intervened between the submission of the manuscript to press and its appearance in print; the article by R. W. Chambers on 'The Lost Literature of Medieval England', for example, listed under item 429, has been largely superseded by R. M. Wilson's book of the same title published by Methuen in 1952. (It is a pity that R. W. Chambers has also been superseded, swallowed up in fact, by E. K. Chambers in Father Stratman's index!) Certainly too late for inclusion, but by no means to be overlooked in any supplements, is the valuable collection of material on pageantry in the Malone Society's third volume of *Collections*. With reference to item 1205, it would, I think, be safer to make it clear that the Sykes MS. contains only one play from the York Cycle, that of Doubting Thomas, and attention should be drawn to A. C. Cawley's important account and edition of this in *Leeds Studies in English*, 1952 (again, perhaps, too late to have been included). Items 2103 and 2124 seem to bear traces of the long-standing confusion of three separate and distinct plays, Redford's *Wit and Science*, in British Museum Additional MS. 15233, an anonymous *Marriage of Wit and Science*, printed by Thomas Marshe in 1570, and *A Contract of Marriage between Wit and Wisdom*, in British Museum Additional MS. 26782, dated 1579 and possibly by the 'Fra. Merbury' whose name appears at the end of it. In connexion with this last-named play there should, if I remember rightly, be an item between 2125 and 2126 referring to Sir Walter Greg's note of disapproval of S. A. Tannenbaum's reading of the date on the manuscript as 1570.

It is, however, as I hinted earlier, generally easy and not altogether fair to pick holes in a bibliography, particularly in one of such dimensions, and only those who have attempted to compile one will understand the labour involved in establishing the accuracy of even a single item. The criticisms and suggestions

put forward here are made in all humility, and without the slightest intention of detracting from the value of what must become an indispensable work of reference for the student of medieval drama. ARTHUR BROWN

The Unity of the Canterbury Tales. By RALPH BALDWIN. Pp. 112 (Anglistica 5). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1955. Kr. 14.50.

Mr. Baldwin is concerned to show the importance of the motif of pilgrimage in the structure of the *Canterbury Tales*: 'the pilgrimage becomes the essence of the *CT* and the stories associated with it are the accidents' (p. 77). Chaucer is presenting in an original form the familiar allegory of the pilgrimage of man, a journey from birth to death, from Creation to the Last Judgement. Unfinished though the *Tales* are, the polished opening (the *Prologue*) and the planned conclusion (the *Parson's Tale* and Chaucer's *Retraction*) reveal the outer design that was shaping in Chaucer's mind. He uses the common spring opening with a difference. His people are inspired by the spring to go devoutly to Canterbury. As Mr. Baldwin points out, this is significant. 'That March and April were particularly synchronized with the redeeming rhythms and that the Easter season was especially imbued with the redemptive mysteries, are facts familiar to all students of medieval life and literature. . . . The celestial and chthonic rhythms beat as triumphant cymbals, and symbols, of salvation' (pp. 24 f.). But spring also brings grief, with the remembrance of the Crucifixion and the thought of the Last Judgement. Man is journeying to *Jerusalem celestial* and his way is by penitence. So, in the final *myrie tale*, by the Parson (to whom they would not listen earlier), the pilgrims are reminded that their merry journey to Canterbury is only a symbol of the inner (and more truly merry) pilgrimage they must make to the celestial City through Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction (cf. p. 47). By means of the *Parson's Tale* Chaucer is projecting 'the inner drama of the confessional against the cavalcade to Canterbury and eternity' (p. 99). Just as the Parson condemns in his homily many of the vices and foibles of the pilgrims, so Chaucer in his retraction condemns his own error. As an artist he had claimed freedom to speak *ful brode*; as a pilgrim like the rest, he repents of the licence he allowed himself. His retraction is thus an essential part of the structure of the *Tales* and the proper conclusion of his outer role as poet. All the tales and their tellers are '"framed" in that common piety, a pilgrimage'. Even in the hostelry before they start, Chaucer sees them already *en route*, each with his burden of his characteristics and his way of life upon him. 'The suffusion then of the static montage of the inn and the dynamic montage of the road . . . gives the illusion of the mobile wayfarer and the resident character' (p. 56).

If this should be an inadequate representation of Mr. Baldwin's main thesis, he has principally himself to blame. His arguments are congested and his style is a nightmare: over-intense, verbose, often grammatically obscure, full of purple passages and jargon ('the duress of the speech situation', '*tranche de vie* perspectivism'). There is occasionally a spirited phrase but it is soon engulfed. Some passages are so ill composed (e.g. pp. 75–76) it is surprising that the editors allowed them to pass. Few readers will have the patience to find their way through the

rhetorical elaborations, and most will be discouraged at the outset by the Introduction.

A number of Mr. Baldwin's statements could be questioned. He has an exaggerated notion of the 'highly organized' society of Chaucer's time, where the 'combination of duty and responsibility for the commonweal made for a ritualized pattern of living, so that the respective classes among a people would, from costume to countenance, be molded into a mass type, with its own loyalties, requisites and awarenesses' (p. 42). Mr. Baldwin's criticism of the *Knight's Tale* as 'technically, perhaps, one of the poorest' of Chaucer's works, will also shake confidence in his judgement.

Nevertheless, though much in Mr. Baldwin's book may not seem new, and much may seem nonsense, he has suggestions to make which are fresh and illuminating. He has, in his own way, proved that 'the ending of the *Canterbury Tales* is as neatly calculated as the beginning' (p. 110). URSULA BROWN

The Court of Venus. Edited and with an Introduction by RUSSELL A. FRASER. Pp. xii + 168. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. 34*s.* net.

Under this title Professor Fraser has collected three fragments representing different editions of what must have been substantially the same anthology of poetry, the chief interest of which is that it contained several poems by Sir Thomas Wyatt and that it first appeared long before *Tottel's Miscellany* (1557). In his introduction Mr. Fraser examines the black-letter type faces in which these fragments were printed, and demonstrates that the first (Douce g. 3 in the Bodleian, 15 leaves) was printed by Thomas Gybson, 1537–9; the second (the 'Stark' fragment, 2 leaves used as end-papers in the copy of More's *Utopia*, tr. Robinson (1551) in the Library of the University of Texas) was printed by William Copland, 1547–9; and the third (8 leaves with title-page in the Folger) by Thomas Marsh, 1561–4. In addition, Mr. Fraser thinks that there may have been another edition following the entry in the Stationers' Register on 19 July 1557 of *The Court of Venus* to Henry Sutton (*Tottel's Miscellany* is dated 5 June). Since he dates Stark 1547–9 it is not clear why it is necessary to postulate another edition in 1549 to account for the attack of John Hall in 1550. Mr. Fraser has an interesting section on other puritan attacks, including North's *Dial of Princes* (1557) and Brice's *The Court of Venus Moralized* (ent. 1566–7). Hall returned to the attack in his *Court of Virtue* (1565), which moralizes some of the poems in *The Court of Venus*—Marsh being the publisher of both works.

Mr. Fraser accepts John Bale's attribution, hitherto overlooked, of *The Court of Venus* to Robert Shyngleton, and concludes that Shyngleton wrote the Prologue (preserved in Folger only) and possibly the much rougher and more archaic *The Pilgrim's Tale*. The latter was reprinted by Furnivall; but with Mr. Fraser's introduction it is now possible to make rather more sense out of this obscure poem, and further light is promised in a forthcoming article on 'Political Prophecy in *The Pilgrim's Tale*', *South Atlantic Quarterly*, lvi (1957). The glossary is

rather fuller than Furnivall's; although it is not correct to say that at 93 (16) Furnivall reads *appostatat* for *appostalat*—both in his glossary and in his text Furnivall gives *Appostalat*. Indeed, Mr. Fraser could have improved his text by rather more reference to the older reprint: at 84 (2) he reads *reprosse* and glosses 'reproach', whereas Douce and Furnivall both read *reproffe* ('reproof'). Other departures from Douce and Furnivall are: 89 (3) *hempyd* for *hemyd*; 90 (3) *iuenting* for *iuenting*; 91 (25) *goddis* for *godis*; 94 (12) *socerus* for *sorcerus*; 97 (20) *make* for *mak*; 98 (28) *Iek* for *Iak*; 102 (12) *atonement* for *at onment*. *U* and *n* are often almost indistinguishable in Douce and it is doubtful whether any useful purpose is served by printing, for example, 'to belene as our cred' or 'the sou beames', and then correcting in the list of errors—particularly as some *u*/*n* errors are silently corrected in the text. The suggestion that in the Prologue, 116 (16) 'And bad no more that my heare should raynt', *raynt* might derive from a word *ream*, 'to shout', is scarcely happy. Venus's clerk has been sent to slack the poet's sorrows, and surely tells him to stop rending or tearing his hair.

Mr. Fraser finds that five out of the fourteen short lyrics in *The Court of Venus* are by Wyatt, and three more are probably his. Contrary to Miss Foxwell's earlier opinion he can now claim that Tottel used the Egerton MS. in preparing his text of Wyatt's poems. Mr. Fraser's text and collations of the Wyatt poems will be useful.

J. R.

Collections Volume III. A Calendar of Dramatic Records in the Books of the Livery Companies of London 1485–1640. Pp. 1+204. Oxford: University Press (for the Malone Society), 1954.

So thoroughly have scholars ransacked historical records for any material that will add to our knowledge of Tudor and Stuart drama that the appearance of a substantial volume of hitherto unpublished documents is as surprising as it is welcome. Miss Jean Robertson and Professor D. J. Gordon have between them transcribed and edited all the dramatic records of the twelve great Livery Companies of London from the surviving Court Books, Account Books, and Apprentice Books, distinguishing with exemplary precision between those extracts which are here printed for the first time, and those which have been quoted, summarized, or incorrectly printed before.

No reader, however, should expect to discover in these Records a collection of documents of like independent importance to Henslowe's Diary or the Fortune Contract. Rather should he remember that, at least in Shakespeare's lifetime, the Companies were supplying the City with those Councillors whose interest was in 'the putting down of plays'. Their records are concerned almost exclusively with civic pageantry; in particular the Midsummer Shows of the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII, and the Lord Mayors' Shows which superseded them.

Sir Edmund Chambers inclined to dismiss such documents as too ephemeral to warrant the tedium of full analysis, a verdict which a general reader is likely to endorse now that the task is accomplished. The editors, however, could well retort that this volume is a source book for specialists: and indeed, it does

contain a quantity of detail which, at the very least, will enable scholars to put to the test of substantial new evidence the various theories confidently advanced in recent years concerning Tudor stagecraft by C. W. Hodges, L. Hotson, G. R. Kernodle, R. Watkins, and others. Kernodle in particular (whom the editors, surprisingly, ignore) has advanced considerably in *From Art to Theatre* (Chicago, 1944) upon the idea initially conceived by Warton and later expanded by F. W. Fairholt (*Lord Mayors' Pageants* (London, 1843)) and R. Withington (*English Pageantry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1918)) that a study of civic pageantry in England and the Low Countries could yield a vivid image of the physical conditions of stage performance so notably lacking from the actual texts of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays. If Kernodle's enthusiasm carried him farther than the available evidence then allowed, and if others have embroidered still further on his assumptions, this Calendar of Dramatic Records does much to confirm their speculations. Not only do we find almost all the important dramatists of the period trafficking freely in their search for a livelihood between the organized theatres and the annual shows of the street, but also schoolmasters, musicians, choristers, and even actors. There is evidence, too, that some roles were taken by girls.

It is, however, the heavy emphasis upon the visual aspect of these shows (both in organization and in execution) that is chiefly remarkable. Simple items in the accounts of the Midsummer Shows of the fifteen-twenties—

> leves of sylu' paper for the King of Moores shoos:
> rede satten of Cipers for Saynt Iohn Euangelestes mantyll:
> making of iiij^{or} soketes iiij^{or} Wynches & iiij^{or} hopys for the pagent of Iesse:

—gradually give place to ever more costly and elaborate spectacle. In the sixteen-twenties the painter Garrett Christmas and his sons can claim to partner Dekker or Heywood in 'devising' the pageants and so parallel the uneasy relationship between Inigo Jones and Ben Jonson in preparing Court Masks: a factor of consequence to anyone interested in the interior appearance of the public playhouse.

In a careful introduction to the records, the editors discuss the iconography of these shows in relation to its sources, supply much useful information about their costing, and consider the spoken and printed texts which accompanied them. Conspicuous by absence, however, is a really coherent reconstruction of the dispositioning of the pageants as they were displayed. It could be argued that such a task falls outside the editors' strict purpose; yet it is difficult to see who is better placed than they to indicate precisely how these 'dramatic records' relate to the regular drama of the time. Items like the following extract from the Ironmongers' Show of 1581 are highly provocative:

> Paid to Thomas Hamon and Austyn Venables . . . to fynd 30 porters to carrie the pagyon and for 10 hogshedes to set the pagyon on. . . .

Why were they 'set' in this way? Did the procession halt for the actual performance? If so, how often? Once only, or several times as was usual with the Miracle plays in York or Chester? And where? The Mercers' pageant of 1537 was

sett uppe at the greate Cundeth in Chepe . . . in Lyke man' to be ordered as it was the yere last paste and better yf it maye be. . . .

Are we to understand that the pageant itself served as the stage, or was it merely a spectacular background device, like the 'mansion' of French Miracle plays, before which the actors performed? The frequency with which place names like Blackwell Hall, where the child-actors dined, the Bell in Carter Lane, or Christ Church where monies were paid in 'recompence towards the pavem' broken' recur, suggests traditional procedures capable of reconstruction.

Perhaps it would be easier to answer these and similar questions which these tantalizing records provoke if they were coupled with those for Royal Entries, Coronations, and so on, which the editors have deliberately excluded on the grounds that they are meaningless unless studied in conjunction with the City Archives at the Guildhall. Nevertheless, the ready access to these records which this scholarly volume now allows should make it possible finally to dispose of Chambers's suspicion that they had lain in 'perhaps merited oblivion' hitherto.

GLYNNE WICKHAM

Leicester Patron of Letters. By ELEANOR ROSENBERG. Pp. xxii + 396. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1955. 42*s.* net.

Miss Rosenberg tells us that Professor Virgil B. Heltzel is completing a survey of patronage from 1550 to 1630. In the meantime her handsomely produced volume is by far the best study of the subject that has appeared. She is at pains to emphasize that the old idea that a dedication immortalized a patron was losing ground in Elizabeth's reign; nor does she think that an author's primary concern was to obtain financial reward. He was more likely to obtain preferment; and a good deal of evidence is assembled in this book to show that Leicester's patronage conferred advancement in the universities, the Church, and in civil posts for his clients.

Miss Rosenberg gives good reasons for believing that Elizabeth delegated the patronage of writers to her nobles—in particular to Leicester and Burghley, Chancellors respectively of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, at which they appeared as 'talent scouts' for likely young men to serve the state. Patronage figures in this volume as an instrument of policy. Historians are patronized because their lessons will be useful to counsellors, translators because their services will be necessary in diplomacy. Miss Rosenberg notes that although Leicester was closely allied to the leaders of the New World movement, this field is scarcely represented among the works dedicated to him. She suggests plausibly that patronage of works on colonization was left to the acknowledged leader of such enterprises, Sir Walter Raleigh.

The decline of the universities was a matter of government concern. Apart from officials there was a dearth of educated clergy to fill the benefices in the Anglican Church. Miss Rosenberg shows that during Elizabeth's reign the numbers and prestige of the universities steadily increased. Whilst Leicester patronized one or two high churchmen like Thomas Cooper, he was the mainstay

of the puritans, whom he often protected against the bishops. Although his main concern may have been political in that the puritans, with their desire for close unity with the continental protestant churches and their anti-catholic pamphlets, favoured his own policy of intervention in the Netherlands against Spain, Miss Rosenberg considers that his puritan sympathies were genuine. She thinks that they may account for his failure to patronize popular fiction; but John Field adjured Leicester to withdraw his countenance from stage plays in vain. For Leicester's approval of academic plays as educational exercises Miss Rosenberg cites his defence of such plays in 1584 against a university decree banning them. She would have found an earlier instance of his practical interest in a letter from Thomas Cooper, dated 5 May 1569, telling the Earl of the exercises and a play prepared against his visit and asking for help in providing apparel and other things needful (*Malone Society Collections*, ii. 145).

In her introduction Miss Rosenberg warns us that the emphasis in her book will not be on imaginative literature. Enough has been said to indicate the kind of works Leicester's policies led him to patronize. It was, moreover, not until the end of his life that the full flowering of Elizabethan poetry came, and in his last decade more poets did dedicate their works to Leicester. Miss Rosenberg also suggests that he may on occasion have delegated the patronage of poets to his poet-nephew, Sir Philip Sidney. The view that Spenser was banished to Ireland in disgrace, if it still had any adherents, is here finally disposed of.

Miss Rosenberg has explored a wide terrain of neglected works and authors: in better-known fields she has been guided by the best books available. An occasional slip is inevitable; on p. 166 the suggestion in the *D.N.B.* that James Sanforde, the translator, may be the 'Mr. Sanford' who became tutor to William Herbert in 1586 is repeated, whereas it is well known that this was Hugh Sandford who prepared the 1593 edition of the *Arcadia* for the press. Thomas Drant appears merely as an eminent scholar who wrote commendatory verses to Robert Peterson's translation of Della Casa's *Galateo* (p. 176). As a strong puritan and anti-papist who addressed poems to Leicester in *A Medicinable Morall* (1566) and *Praesul* (?1578)[1] he deserves a place in the story.

The appendix gives a chronological list of works dedicated to Leicester. If the items supplied by Professor Franklin B. Williams, who is preparing a classification of *S.T.C.* titles under patrons, are included, these works number over a hundred. Miss Rosenberg's modest claim that the titles have been transcribed 'with as much accuracy as was possible for one not skilled in the arts of the expert bibliographer' is amply justified.

J. R.

[1] See John Buxton, *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* (London, 1954), pp. 33, 79. In a note to p. xiv Miss Rosenberg regrets that this work appeared too late for her reference.

The Roanoke Voyages 1584–1590. Edited by DAVID BEERS QUINN. Vol. I, pp. xxxvi+496; Vol. II, pp. vi+497–1004 (Hakluyt Society, Second Series CIV). London: Cambridge University Press for the Society. £6 net.

These two volumes present a comprehensive collection of the documents that illustrate the English voyages to North America made under the six-year patent granted to Walter Raleigh in 1584. In 1940, under the same skilled editorship, the Hakluyt Society published a collection of documents on the voyages and colonizing enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert. When the Society has followed these volumes with a further volume or volumes taking the series down to the foundation of the Virginia Company, it will have fully documented the English voyages to and colonizing ventures in North America before 1607.

Most of the major documents in the volumes under review will be familiar to readers of Hakluyt. Here is Arthur Barlowe's discourse of the first voyage of 1584, with its tribute to the Noble Savage and its all-too-favourable account of the Carolina Banks and Roanoke Island and their dangerous coasts and of the swamps on the neighbouring mainland, an account obviously written for purposes of propaganda. Here is Ralph Lane's narrative of the experiences and explorations of the colony which spent the year 1585–6 in Virginia with Roanoke Island as their base. But for the presence of Drake on that coast in June 1586 and the untimely storm which wrecked or scattered part of his fleet, this first colony might possibly have settled and spread northwards to more propitious sites on Chesapeake Bay. Here is Hariot's remarkable *Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia* (1588), which together with the as remarkable drawings of his fellow traveller John White make their work 'a landmark in the history of English cartography and the natural sciences, as well as, almost incidentally, in the development of a native school of water-colour painting' (35). Here is the journal of the 1587 expedition to Roanoke Island kept by Governor John White, certainly the grandfather of Virginia Dare and pretty certainly (Professor Quinn argues) identical with the artist: if so, he was a better cartographer and artist than he was leader. And, lastly, here is White's journal of the voyage of 1590 with its account of the vain search for the settlers of 1587, the fate of whom remains a mystery to this day. Most poignant is the story of how the voyagers arrived—on a night 'exceeding dark'—at the place on the Island where the colonists had been left three years earlier, and how they 'sounded with a trumpet a Call, & afterwardes many familiar English tunes of Songs, and called to them friendly; but we had no answere' (613). No one with any sense of the past can read unmoved these narratives of 'the first English attempts to plant garrisons and enduring communities on North American soil' (ix).

But the narratives in Hakluyt can now be supplemented by many minor documents, especially from the records of the High Court of Admiralty, from the Colonial State Papers, and from Spanish archives. If these subsidiary documents raise as many problems as they solve, they are not less interesting for that reason. Many of these problems are proposed by the editor in a series of questions (11–12), and to all of them he attempts answers in the full and learned introductions and notes which add so much to the value and distinction of this edition.

That documents still unprinted may exist in public and private collections in this country, and especially perhaps in Spain, Mr. Quinn is well aware, though he and his many helpers have made diligent search for them; but many that we should most wish to see have vanished, no doubt, for ever. Nothing or almost nothing from Raleigh about his share in these enterprises; nothing from Grenville about his part, and we are left to surmise how much truth there may be in Lane's accusations against him; and not a single 'log, journal or narrative which can be checked against Hakluyt's published versions' (11). Most serious is the loss of Hariot's notebooks and chronicle (54, 387); his pamphlet, merely a preliminary report designed to rebut the many false rumours about Virginia, discusses its plants and animals and inhabitants in a temper which the editor does not hesitate to call scientific (39).

Of particular interest to readers of this Review is the light which these documents and the comments of the editor throw upon Hariot during the years when he was in Raleigh's household and before he entered the service of the ninth Earl of Northumberland about 1594. His usefulness as a voyager was not confined to his skill in astronomical observation, in natural history, and in mathematics. From the two Indians brought back in 1584 he appears to have learnt the Algonquian tongue, at the same time teaching the Indians English. Also of interest is the editor's discussion of Hakluyt's methods as an editor (12–15). In handling documentary material he was in many respects in advance of his age: comparison with the patent of 1584 and with Hariot's pamphlet shows him to have respected the text, if not its precise wording. The attention of philologists may be drawn to the study of the language of the Carolina Algonquian tribes contributed by the Rev. James A. Geary (873–900).

Two or three special points may be noted. In the sketch-map of Virginia of September 1585, of which a much reduced facsimile is given (215), the word which the editor transcribes 'berither' certainly begins with 'be' and ends with 'the' and may be 'berithe', i.e. beareth. At p. 402 in Theodor de Bry's epistle to Raleigh before his *America*, pt. 1 (Frankfort, 1590), in the sentence 'Yt is good raison that euery man euertwe him selfe. . . ', 'euertwe' is not *for* 'exert', but is an anglicization of the French *(s')évertuer*, to exert (oneself). De Bry's English is peculiar, and is not made less so by his printer. A third point is of more interest, and I am indebted for it to the generosity and learning of Dr. F. S. Ferguson. At p. 3 the editor mentions 'the unique copy' in the John Carter Brown Library of Christopher Carleill's two-sheet quarto *A discourse vpon the entended Voyage to the hethermoste partes of America* (1583), a pamphlet unknown to him when he reprinted it in his work on Gilbert from Hakluyt's 1589 text. Dr. Ferguson has now discovered another edition printed by the same printer (identified by him as John Kingston), apparently of the same year, and with a fuller title-page, beginning *A breef and sommarie discourse vppon the entended Voyage to the hethermoste partes of America*. Copies are at Dulwich College and Westminster Abbey. That Hakluyt followed this latter and probably later edition is proved by the fact that he reprinted its title-page without the alteration of a single word.

F. P. Wilson

The Poor Man's Comfort. By ROBERT DABORNE. Pp. xviii+96. Oxford: University Press (for the Malone Society), 1954 (1955).

July and Julian. Pp. xxiv+46.

Dick of Devonshire. Pp. xx+86. Oxford: University Press (for the Malone Society), 1955.

These three texts, issued simultaneously to members of the Malone Society, are all reprinted from manuscripts. Both *The Poor Man's Comfort* and *Dick of Devonshire* are from MS. Egerton 1994, but *The Poor Man's Comfort* also appeared in a quarto of 1655 and *Dick of Devonshire* was first printed by A. H. Bullen in 1883. Only *July and Julian* has not been previously available; it is edited from the manuscript in the Folger Shakespeare Library by a member of the Library's staff, Dr. Giles E. Dawson.

The mere fact that *July and Julian* has never been printed before gives it more interest than the editions of the other two plays. The surviving text, the editor reports, is probably in the hand of a scribe, and was presumably copied out some time during the 1560's. The play itself is most likely to have been the composition of a schoolmaster, for there is little doubt that it was intended for performance by schoolboys. *July and Julian* thus belongs to the same type of classical comedy as *Ralph Roister Doister* and *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, but falls below them in literary interest, though it is by no means as bad a piece as the earlier *Thersites*. *Ralph Roister Doister* and *Gammer Gurton's Needle* owe their reputations to their very real liveliness, to a certain kind of structural *finesse*, and to the skill with which they fuse classical types and conventions with the realities of sixteenth-century English life. *July and Julian* possesses something of the same liveliness, but rather less structural *finesse*; the comedy, however, is neither completely English nor completely classical. The characters and setting seem English, but, as the editor points out, 'the three servants in the Chremes family, though never so called, appear in fact to be slaves after the Roman model. Julian, the maid-servant, is actually sold for cash, and the two male servants, Wilkin and Fennell, are moved to a vigorous prosecution of their conspiracy by the promise of obtaining their liberty.'

Dr. and Mrs. J. G. McManaway are the editors of *Dick of Devonshire*. Though the play has been printed twice before it is useful to have at last an accurate transcript of the manuscript, and the introduction contains an admirable summary of the problems connected with the play: its provenance, source, date, and authorship. On the other hand, Mr. Kenneth Palmer's introduction to *The Poor Man's Comfort* is a tantalizing rather than a definitive discussion. Reference is made to the quarto text if it elucidates a reading of the manuscript, or if it omits a phrase or sentence which is found in the manuscript, and the editor records his belief that the quarto is based on the prompt copy while the manuscript is descended from the author's foul papers; nevertheless, we are told that 'the relationship between the two texts cannot be discussed here'. It is to be hoped that, with the text of the manuscript now available, the problem will soon be fully investigated.

R. C. BALD

The Life and Death of King Richard the Second. Edited by MATTHEW W. BLACK. Pp. xxxii+656 (New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. General Editor: HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS). Philadelphia and London: Lippincott, 1955.

Professor Black has been at work on this edition for twenty-seven years and has collated seventy-two editions for his textual notes; his 'list of works consulted' numbers nearly a thousand items. These figures suggest immense industry, of which every page gives evidence, and an overcrowded book, which Mr. Black has triumphantly avoided. This is particularly noticeable in the commentary; it is a miracle of elegant compression, arrived at by the stern methods of curtailment explained on p. xxv, and obviously guided throughout by an editorial determination to bring the light to bear on Shakespeare's play and not on the opinions and eccentricities of his critics. I am glad that he has relaxed now and then to admit such things as Max Beerbohm on III. ii. 7–14, or the Warwickshire rustic on V. iv. 28.[1] After the play comes an Appendix of some 250 pages, of which a hundred are given over to the important matter of the sources, and only sixty to 'Criticisms'. In this section, too, the editor has exercised a judicious economy, and where he is obliged to summarize a whole strain of criticism (as on pp. 529, 532–3), his work is likely to be particularly useful. Indeed, it could be argued that, in the Variorum series as a whole, this part of the work should be allowed to approach a good deal nearer to an amply annotated editorial essay and survey, of the sort, perhaps, that has been a feature of the *Shakespeare Survey* volumes. The life goes out of the more vital critiques of the play, such as those of Hazlitt, Yeats, Tillyard, or Palmer, when they repose in extracts, dried, pressed, and redistributed under the somewhat questionable subdivisions ('The Play as a Whole', 'Style and Imagery', 'The Characters' . . .) of a Variorum Appendix. It would be better if the reader were guided to such things in their full context, and could benefit at the same time from a graspable survey of the whole development of attitudes to the play. This method would also have left space in the commentary for the discussion of certain important matters which Black has felt obliged to leave out.

First amongst these comes the decision to omit from the commentary editorial discussion of the *varia* (p. xxv). The section on the Quartos in the Appendix on the Texts is, of course, dominated by the work of Pollard. But Black presents important new information about the Petworth Castle copy of Q1, which he has for the first time collated. His examination reveals that there are further press-corrections on sheet D. Of the four errors in the Petworth copy on this sheet (corrected in the other three copies), two are especially interesting. These are the omissions of one-line interruptions of speeches at II. i. 194–6 and II. ii. 35–36. It is not clear why Black, who regards these omissions as probably due to author's marginal revisions overlooked by the compositor, should reject (p. 358) the possibility that one of them at least may be due to the workman's eye-skip. At II. ii. 35–36 the words omitted by Petworth are the speech-prefix *Bush.*, followed by his line, 'Tis nothing but conceit my gratious Lady', and (l. 36) the speech-prefix *Queene*, preceding her resumption and reply, 'Tis nothing

[1] Line-references are to Black's text.

lesse: conceit is still deriude / From some forefather griefe. . . '. Here the missing line opens with the same two words as the succeeding line; the compositor could have skipped, especially if the speech-prefixes in the copy for Q1 were written well over in the left-hand margin, which this accident suggests they may have been. Nor are we forced to Black's conclusion that the press-reviser, whose work is represented by the passage as restored in the three other copies, needed to be 'very keen': in the Petworth version there is an obvious break in the sense, which might easily attract the attention of even the casual reviser to whom Pollard attributed the press-corrections. I do not pretend to understand what has happened at Petworth II. i. 194–6, but surely the possibility should be considered that the omission is somehow related to the well-known difficulty about line 193: 'Or else he neuer would compare betweene.', which Pollard interpreted as York's sobbing breakdown, and *O.E.D.* as a unique example of the absolute use of 'compare between' meaning 'draw comparisons'. Perhaps there is further damage in all copies, of which Petworth gives the hint, but which the press-reviser failed to do more than partially cure. Black has collated, apart from the four copies of Q1, twenty-five other copies of Qq 2–5, a tremendous labour, which will be of great value to all future workers on the text.

Because of the omission of the 'deposition scene' in Q1 (see p. xiii), the text chosen for reproduction was a copy of the Folio at Pennsylvania University. This was an odd decision, and leads to various inconveniences, such as a rash of asterisks and letter-numbered lines where Black inserts in his F text the nine passages from Q1 not found in F, and there is the major inconvenience of having continually before our eyes the less rather than the more authoritative text. Black would, I think, have put future editors, constrained to work from facsimiles, yet further in his debt if he had presented instead a fresh facsimile of Q1, especially in view of the defectiveness of the Griggs facsimile, to which he draws disturbing attention on p. 359. Reproduction of F could then have been confined to the 'deposition scene', a unit of a kind. As has been mentioned, Black does not usually himself contribute to the discussion of disputed readings in the commentary. However great the pressure on space, this seems to be carrying the necessarily somewhat 'neutralist' position of a Variorum editor rather too far. When we turn with some excitement to see what he has to say about such things as 'yong dangling Aphricokes' (III. iv. 34) or 'young hot colts being ragde' (II. i. 74) we find only Wilson, Pollard, and the other appellants ding-donging it out on the field of combat, with the umpire's throne conspicuously untenanted. This is not always so, however; sometimes, rather surprisingly, even the appellants have been banished (as in the failure to record Wilson on 'euermore thanke's' at II. iii. 73), and sometimes Black does allow himself a decisive aside (as at III. ii. 39) or a larger excursus (as at III. iii. 63–64).

A conspicuous feature of the commentary is its constant and precise use of *O.E.D.* The editor is rightly prepared, on occasion, as at I. i. 77 and IV. i. 289, to reject even this authority when it seems at fault, and in cases where the definitions offered by *O.E.D.* do not convey the several shades of meaning attached to a word in a Shakespearian poetic context—subtler shades than a

The Life and Death of King Richard the Second. Edited by MATTHEW W. BLACK. Pp. xxxii+656 (New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. General Editor: HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS). Philadelphia and London: Lippincott, 1955.

Professor Black has been at work on this edition for twenty-seven years and has collated seventy-two editions for his textual notes; his 'list of works consulted' numbers nearly a thousand items. These figures suggest immense industry, of which every page gives evidence, and an overcrowded book, which Mr. Black has triumphantly avoided. This is particularly noticeable in the commentary; it is a miracle of elegant compression, arrived at by the stern methods of curtailment explained on p. xxv, and obviously guided throughout by an editorial determination to bring the light to bear on Shakespeare's play and not on the opinions and eccentricities of his critics. I am glad that he has relaxed now and then to admit such things as Max Beerbohm on III. ii. 7–14, or the Warwickshire rustic on v. iv. 28.[1] After the play comes an Appendix of some 250 pages, of which a hundred are given over to the important matter of the sources, and only sixty to 'Criticisms'. In this section, too, the editor has exercised a judicious economy, and where he is obliged to summarize a whole strain of criticism (as on pp. 529, 532–3), his work is likely to be particularly useful. Indeed, it could be argued that, in the Variorum series as a whole, this part of the work should be allowed to approach a good deal nearer to an amply annotated editorial essay and survey, of the sort, perhaps, that has been a feature of the *Shakespeare Survey* volumes. The life goes out of the more vital critiques of the play, such as those of Hazlitt, Yeats, Tillyard, or Palmer, when they repose in extracts, dried, pressed, and redistributed under the somewhat questionable subdivisions ('The Play as a Whole', 'Style and Imagery', 'The Characters' . . .) of a Variorum Appendix. It would be better if the reader were guided to such things in their full context, and could benefit at the same time from a graspable survey of the whole development of attitudes to the play. This method would also have left space in the commentary for the discussion of certain important matters which Black has felt obliged to leave out.

First amongst these comes the decision to omit from the commentary editorial discussion of the *varia* (p. xxv). The section on the Quartos in the Appendix on the Texts is, of course, dominated by the work of Pollard. But Black presents important new information about the Petworth Castle copy of Q1, which he has for the first time collated. His examination reveals that there are further press-corrections on sheet D. Of the four errors in the Petworth copy on this sheet (corrected in the other three copies), two are especially interesting. These are the omissions of one-line interruptions of speeches at II. i. 194–6 and II. ii. 35–36. It is not clear why Black, who regards these omissions as probably due to author's marginal revisions overlooked by the compositor, should reject (p. 358) the possibility that one of them at least may be due to the workman's eye-skip. At II. ii. 35–36 the words omitted by Petworth are the speech-prefix *Bush.*, followed by his line, 'Tis nothing but conceit my gratious Lady', and (l. 36) the speech-prefix *Queene*, preceding her resumption and reply, 'Tis nothing

[1] Line-references are to Black's text.

lesse: conceit is still deriude / From some forefather griefe. . . '. Here the missing line opens with the same two words as the succeeding line; the compositor could have skipped, especially if the speech-prefixes in the copy for Q1 were written well over in the left-hand margin, which this accident suggests they may have been. Nor are we forced to Black's conclusion that the press-reviser, whose work is represented by the passage as restored in the three other copies, needed to be 'very keen': in the Petworth version there is an obvious break in the sense, which might easily attract the attention of even the casual reviser to whom Pollard attributed the press-corrections. I do not pretend to understand what has happened at Petworth II. i. 194–6, but surely the possibility should be considered that the omission is somehow related to the well-known difficulty about line 193: 'Or else he neuer would compare betweene.', which Pollard interpreted as York's sobbing breakdown, and *O.E.D.* as a unique example of the absolute use of 'compare between' meaning 'draw comparisons'. Perhaps there is further damage in all copies, of which Petworth gives the hint, but which the press-reviser failed to do more than partially cure. Black has collated, apart from the four copies of Q1, twenty-five other copies of Qq 2–5, a tremendous labour, which will be of great value to all future workers on the text.

Because of the omission of the 'deposition scene' in Q1 (see p. xiii), the text chosen for reproduction was a copy of the Folio at Pennsylvania University. This was an odd decision, and leads to various inconveniences, such as a rash of asterisks and letter-numbered lines where Black inserts in his F text the nine passages from Q1 not found in F, and there is the major inconvenience of having continually before our eyes the less rather than the more authoritative text. Black would, I think, have put future editors, constrained to work from facsimiles, yet further in his debt if he had presented instead a fresh facsimile of Q1, especially in view of the defectiveness of the Griggs facsimile, to which he draws disturbing attention on p. 359. Reproduction of F could then have been confined to the 'deposition scene', a unit of a kind. As has been mentioned, Black does not usually himself contribute to the discussion of disputed readings in the commentary. However great the pressure on space, this seems to be carrying the necessarily somewhat 'neutralist' position of a Variorum editor rather too far. When we turn with some excitement to see what he has to say about such things as 'yong dangling Aphricokes' (III. iv. 34) or 'young hot colts being ragde' (II. i. 74) we find only Wilson, Pollard, and the other appellants ding-donging it out on the field of combat, with the umpire's throne conspicuously untenanted. This is not always so, however; sometimes, rather surprisingly, even the appellants have been banished (as in the failure to record Wilson on 'euermore thanke's' at II. iii. 73), and sometimes Black does allow himself a decisive aside (as at III. ii. 39) or a larger excursus (as at III. iii. 63–64).

A conspicuous feature of the commentary is its constant and precise use of *O.E.D.* The editor is rightly prepared, on occasion, as at I. i. 77 and IV. i. 289, to reject even this authority when it seems at fault, and in cases where the definitions offered by *O.E.D.* do not convey the several shades of meaning attached to a word in a Shakespearian poetic context—subtler shades than a

lexicographer may have any warrant to acknowledge—Black usually, but not always, supplements them with the editors' refinements. It seems like cavilling to fasten upon particular points for criticism in a commentary which is at once so learned and so light-handed in its marshalling of a huge body of commentators. I think that the note on the Crown and Buckets image (IV. i. 186–91) is less helpful than it should be, because of the decision, apparently a deliberate one (see p. 540), to omit discussion and citation of Tilley's *Dictionary of Proverbs*. But Tilley surely has a royal right of entry into such an edition as this, and in the case under review the citation of an isolated parallel from Day's *Ile of Guls* is quite misleading. At V. iii. 86 (The 'Beggar and King') we are similarly scanted of comment—Ivor B. John's is surely essential to the understanding of the line, and Firth's, which is given, seems rather pointless in isolation; at I. iii. 266h it seems to me that Baldwin's ingenious theories have elbowed out a needed quotation from *Euphues*, to the reader's disadvantage; it appears that we must have Queen Elizabeth's joke in full in order to understand 'The cheapest of vs is ten grotes too deare' (V. iv. 71); and could not Black have intervened effectively at V. iv. 51–53, as he does in some other places where the commentators are at a stand? Black says (p. xxv) that he has compressed or omitted comments on the literary merits of individual lines and passages; it is not always easy to distinguish between this kind of comment and the critics' analyses of how they feel the characters are behaving at given moments in the play; but I think that things like Pater's comments, as given on p. 203, Swinburne's (p. 295), Newbolt's, and others' on pp. 327–8, or Chambers's observation that Richard is 'too self-conscious and theatrical for a Greek' (p. 181), are, if they are anything, really 'literary criticism' and would have looked better in the Appendix. These are minor points and need not detract from our admiration for the commentary as a whole, which will prove itself more and more as a just court of appeal. One of its most startling notes is hardly, perhaps, a minor matter (III. iii. 63–64), and it is also one of the rare occasions when Black steps forward almost entirely on his own; if he is right about the Q1 punctuation, and about the interpretation of the lines, then Hazlitt was right about Bolingbroke, and the long contention about the usurper's character is settled. But I think it most unlikely that Black's view will win general acceptance.

In the Appendix the editor has rightly devoted a great deal of space to the source-material, and ably summarizes discussion about it. Here again, though I am perhaps once more mistaking the nature of a Variorum editor's duty, I find his own virtual silence a trifle disappointing. The parallels between the play and the seven alleged sources have heaped themselves up into a mountain of confusion, liberally planted with mare's nests, as anyone can see who looks at the references to the play and commentary given at the foot of the reprinted portions of these sources. But no attempt has been made to sort out these parallels, or the arguments which have grown up round them, into some kind of order by type, precedence, or validity. Every 'echo', every 'germ', every 'hint', however feeble and faintly heard, seems to be here, and they fly from half a dozen different 'sources', like so many steel-filings, to cluster together upon magnetic points in the text. But there is nobody to decide upon their right to

be there, to balance the claims of one against the other, or to wage war against the multiplication of hypotheses. The 'fresh survey and synthesis' of the whole matter for which Professor Jenkins called in 1953 (see p. 505) has not been undertaken, although of course this section of the Appendix provides a wonderfully complete and convenient mass of evidence, such as has never been brought together before, for anyone who wishes to undertake it. It is a matter for regret that Black prints his extracts from Créton and *Traïson* in the translations of nineteenth-century editors of those works; these are plainly useless, except as cribs, to investigators, who will have to turn back to the French texts in either print or manuscript. It is surprising to see no reprinting and, if the index is accurate, only six mentions in the whole volume, of *The Mirror for Magistrates*: at least the Richard, Mowbray, and Woodstock 'tragedies' should be here, for Miss Campbell's edition is expensive and becoming rare. Black rightly saves space by not reprinting any part of *Woodstock*, which is available in several editions, but this leads him into some inconsistency in his method of noting the parallels—the footnote references have to be abandoned, and we are referred instead to eight separate entries in the Index. It is doubtless an oversight that he fails to record on p. 473 Greg's opinion (in *Dramatic Documents* . . ., ii. 251) on the date of the manuscript, more authoritative than any that he does quote. In an Appendix such as this it is probably no part of an editor's duty to consider other kinds of 'source'-material: but I suspect that much more will have to be done on matters which Black leaves alone, such as the background of the Garden Scene, or of the 'this England' speech, treated as an inspired epitome of the commonplaces of Elizabethan patriotic pamphlets. It is doubtful if anything that Gaunt says, during his brief but glorious career as a dramatic character, is not topological. Such investigations may tell us more about Shakespeare's art than speculations on the French chronicle sources.

The volume concludes with Sections on the Stage History and on Elizabeth and Essex. A very large number of the titles in the 'List of Works Consulted' is quite new to me; amongst the few omissions of writings containing relevant material which I have noted are those of Heffner's second article on the Essex question (*P.M.L.A.*, 1932), the books by Yoder (1947) and Hankins (1953), Spitzer's article in *Traditio* (1945), and F. P. Wilson's important review of Tilley's *Dictionary* in this journal (1952). It is strange that Peter Alexander's edition (1951) is neither mentioned nor collated, although Sisson's (1954) is quoted in the commentary. The German printers of this book have done a splendid job of work, and a speedy one, judging by the dates of some of the writings which Black has been able to use. He is to be warmly congratulated on so successful a completion of his gigantic task. It is a fine example of devoted scholarship and a notable addition to this famous series. PETER URE

On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists. By FREDSON BOWERS. Pp. x+132. University of Pennsylvania Library, for the Rosenbach Foundation; London: Cumberlege, 1955. 21*s.* net.

'Enough! Thou hast convinced me, that no human being can ever be an

editor.' So Rasselas might have exclaimed at a pause in Professor Bowers's lectures. But though the author does not conceal that 'to be an editor is indeed very difficult', the careful reader will be more encouraged than dismayed by this closely packed book. Mr. Bowers does not think that his own generation is 'likely to see what can be called a definitive text of Shakespeare', but, if anything, he is open to the charge of excessive optimism when he looks forward, in his final sentence, to the eventual achievement of 'a text . . . that in the most minute detail is as close as mortal man can come to the original truth'. But it is clear that this hope does not rest on any belief that improved methods alone will ensure such a text. On the contrary, he insists that 'if an editor is incompetent, he will produce an incompetent edition under any circumstances'.

Few recent books give the reader a comparable sense of being right on the frontier of knowledge. Again and again we are invited to look at the unsolved problems on which Mr. Bowers himself is engaged, and the notes contain references to six forthcoming articles by various hands, most of them in the author's own *Studies in Bibliography*. Yet the lectures avoid giving undue stress to the new merely because it is new. The comments that follow are far from exhausting the wealth of material the book contains.

The first lecture, on 'The Texts and Their Manuscripts', is mainly devoted to analysing current beliefs about 'foul papers' as copy for Shakespeare texts. Mr. Bowers, in independent agreement, it is interesting to note, with Leo Kirschbaum's *Shakespeare and the Stationers*, holds that 'the present-day tendency to the mass assignment of any printer's copy as foul papers, when there is some presumed evidence in the printed text of authorial characteristics and none of theatrical prompt copy, has gone too far and is in need of re-examination', and the re-examination he makes is searching and provocative. To some extent, the controversy is a verbal one. 'Foul papers' and 'fair copy' are not rigorously defined terms. Mr. Bowers offers a closer definition of foul papers as 'the author's last complete draft in a shape satisfactory to him to be transferred to a fair copy', and he brings out how such alternative descriptions as 'original draft' involve reading rather too much into Heminge and Condell's praise of Shakespeare's fluency.[1] It is suggested that 'what the company might technically regard as Shakespeare's foul papers . . . would be much closer in form to a revised fair copy, and thus freer from blemishes than true foul papers, or "original drafts", such as are traditionally conjectured to have been his papers given to the company for transcription'. But there is a real problem underlying these uncertainties of terminology. Mr. Bowers presents a strong case against the current assumption that what Shakespeare gave his company was normally foul papers ready to be transcribed into a fair copy which would then be used as prompt copy. He has particularly interesting comments on Sir Walter Greg's assumption that an author's fair copy, where one was submitted, would necessarily become the prompt book, in spite of the difficulties this assumption involves for such a play as *The Merchant of Venice*. Daborne's letters to Henslowe are examined, and the doctrine that Henslowe's company differed from others

[1] But on this, and on the whole 'foul papers' question, Sir Walter Greg's rejoinder in *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vii (1956), 101–4, must be consulted.

in requiring fair copy in order to save the expense of transcribing the foul papers is shown to be very insecurely based. Mr. Bowers does not specifically refer to one phrase of Daborne's which has been used to support the fair copy/prompt book equation. Sir Walter Greg (*Editorial Problem*, pp. 27–28) writes that Daborne 'promises that he "will not fail to write this fair and perfit the book"—the "book" being, then as now, the technical term for the prompt copy'. This raises a question that could do with re-examination. Even if it is true, as Chambers writes, that 'the ordinary Elizabethan term for an authoritative stage-copy was simply "the book" ' (*William Shakespeare*, i. 97), it is rash to assume that any reference in a theatrical context to a 'book' must refer to a prompt copy, even if there is no contextual support. It may be recalled that even in the well-known note in the *Bonduca* manuscript, the more explicit phrase is used, 'the booke where by it was first Acted from'. If the Daborne sentence is taken as a whole—'I will not fayle to write this fayr and perfit the book which shall not ly on your hands'—the natural interpretation seems to me to be that the 'book' is simply the composition as such, in contradistinction to either the foul or the fair copy; just as when Robert Shaa writes to Henslowe (*Henslowe Papers*, p. 49), 'we haue heard their booke and lyke it', he can scarcely be taken to refer to the specific form in which the play has come to him. Mr. Bowers's note on the probability that the prompt book would normally be prepared at a fairly late stage, so as to incorporate as far as possible changes decided on in rehearsal, is highly relevant here.

The editorial consequences of being more ready than is customary to accept fair copy intermediate between foul papers and prompt book are not exaggerated by Mr. Bowers, who notes that 'in great part the customary evidence used to distinguish foul-papers copy does no such thing and would be as generally applicable to authorial fair copy as to foul papers'. The further suggestion that the copy for certain plays usually taken to derive from foul papers is actually scribal is more disturbing—'chaos has come again', the author himself writes—but as it is not worked out it cannot be discussed here.

The second lecture, 'The Function of Textual Criticism and Bibliography', is the most technical of the three, and deals with a number of problems of special interest to editors of *Hamlet*. One or two comments must suffice. In the discussion of variant states, the valuable warning is given that 'the uncritical acceptance of all corrected readings in the name of bibliography is a dangerous and thoroughly illogical practice when they cannot be demonstrated to arise from consultation of the manuscript'. But it is not quite accurate to adduce in support 'a classic rule of emendation' in the form, 'when variants appear in two texts of unequal authority, and the reading of the generally superior text is corrupt, an editor should make every effort to recover the true reading from the corruption before accepting from an inferior text a reading which makes sense but which could never have been the word behind the corruption'. If the inferior text is of any authority at all, then its reading must be fairly considered alongside that of the superior text, though with a certain presumption in favour of starting from the latter, especially if the easier reading of the inferior text looks like an attempt to evade the difficulties of the superior. (Dover Wilson's *bait* in *Hamlet*, III. iii. 79.

from Q2 *base*, in preference to F *hyre*, whether it is right or wrong, is a case in point.) But if the inferior text is of no authority, then emendation *must* start from the only substantive reading, even if the editor should come to the conclusion that the inferior text has emended correctly. Similarly, what Mr. Bowers's argument about a variant in *Sir Thomas Wyat* proves is not strictly that 'the temptation' to read *deiected* from Q2 for Q1's *defected* 'must be resisted', but only that *deiected* is no more than a conjectural emendation. And when he later writes that, in a portion of a reprint which can be shown by bibliographical arguments to contain no authorial changes, the editor 'must ignore it unless it corrects a manifest error that he would have altered on his own responsibility', the word 'manifest' would be better away. I stress these minutiae just because Mr. Bowers is in general so sound in his opposition to the nonsensical doctrine that an editor should remove only obvious errors and should play safe when any sense can be extracted from the transmitted text.

A minor question of interest is raised by the reference to Dr. Alice Walker's hypothesis 'that a compositor who is in haste will be more faithful to the accidentals of his copy and will exhibit fewer of his own characteristic spellings &c.', against which Mr. Bowers conjectures that 'the more rushed a compositor, the more text he would attempt to memorize before turning to his cases, and thus the less opportunity or incentive there would be for copy-spellings to impress themselves on his mind'. I suspect the problem is misleadingly formulated, in so far as both writers suggest, perhaps unintentionally, that faithfulness to the accidentals of his copy would enter into the compositor's aims, whereas in fact his governing intention would be to normalize in accordance with his own conventions. I should expect the result to vary according as the compositor had or had not identified the word in his copy as one he habitually spelt in such and such a way. If his haste had prevented his doing this, he would be more likely than if composing at leisure to set up exactly what was in the copy, and for such cases Dr. Walker would be right. But if the identification had taken place, then the faster he was working, the less would be any countervailing influence of the copy, and Mr. Bowers would be right. Whether the results would ever be clear enough to afford independent evidence that a compositor had in fact been hurried remains uncertain.

In the final lecture, Mr. Bowers turns to 'The Method for a Critical Edition'. He distinguishes between 'the three major categories: the facsimile, the diplomatic, and the critical text', and it is gratifying to find that he admits no half-way house between the first two and the third—an editor who 'alters so much as a comma of his document . . . is committed to the critical method'. Thus he rejects such suggestions as that by Professor Shaaber, which I objected to in *R.E.S.*, N.S. i (1950), 279, that 'there is room for an edition which would reproduce the most authoritative text of each play with no editing at all except to correct undoubted mistakes and make good undoubted omissions'. He passes over the special problems facing editors of modernized texts, though mentioning that 'at least one such editor believes that the problem of consistent practice in a modernized text is more acute than in old spelling'—I should be more interested to hear of an editor who believed the opposite. After noting how 'Greg's recent

position appears to substitute principles for McKerrow's over-mechanical rules', and explaining the editor's 'synthesis' of the existing documents and the hypothetical original, he goes on to discuss some radical differences between classical and Elizabethan textual criticism. This section, which includes a lively but friendly debate, carried on both in text and in notes, with Dr. Alice Walker, does not seem to me to achieve full lucidity, and I shall conclude with some comments on it. First of all, a point of wording. At the opening of the first lecture, Mr. Bowers writes, 'If these lectures have any theme, it is this: "In editing it is necessary to proceed on consistent assumptions." ' Reference to 'consistency of assumption' is frequent, but in the final lecture it occurs in an odd form in the sentence, 'when texts are polygenous in descent, consistency of assumption as a basis for decision on any individual reading is wellnigh impossible between the heads of two independent series of texts', and later, 'if one text is as good as another, no consistent assumptions can be made'. It is clear from the context that what is meant is not that the existence of independent texts makes it impossible to frame consistent assumptions, but that, in such circumstances, consistency of assumption does not in itself point to the choice of this reading rather than that. One other preliminary comment is on the remark that the eighteenth-century editors of Shakespeare were familiar with the principles of classical textual criticism that Mr. Bowers has just outlined. He seems to have forgotten the undeveloped state of critical principles in the pre-Lachmannian era.

Now for the central argument. First, it is claimed that the link between Quarto and Folio in *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and other plays means that the descent is 'essentially monogenous'. I am not sure that it makes sense to talk of the relation as 'essentially' either monogenous or polygenous. Dr. Walker, quoted in the notes, writes that 'all variants between the two texts for which the Folio compositors were not responsible were due to an underlying polygenous strain', and Mr. Bowers does not really want to deny this. He does, however, try to distinguish between classical and Elizabethan textual criticism as follows: 'In the former, common readings are ordinarily taken as authoritative since it is usually impossible to tell whether the distant ancestors of the two independent lines radiated directly from the archetype or from a hypothetical derivation from the archetype assumed to have introduced errors. In the latter, shared readings carry no such weight, for with Shakespeare corruption from a quarto can be repeated in the Folio by negligence of the Folio editor.' This does bring out a difference. The presence of a common reading in two manuscripts which have no known common ancestor points to its derivation from the archetype (which, though 'authoritative', may of course be corrupt). By contrast, the agreement say, of F with Q2 in a reading in *Hamlet* does not point so strongly to its presence in the original manuscript; but it is wrong to say that it has *no* weight—Mr. Bowers's 'no such weight' is ambiguous—since 'negligence of the Folio editor' is a hypothesis not to be invoked unless there is positive reason to suspect a reading. If the 'authoritative' reading merely means the only reading for which documentary evidence can be claimed, then a reading in *Hamlet* common to Q2 and F is just as authoritative as a reading common to two independent manuscripts of a classical author. I do not think Mr. Bowers has demolished Dr.

Walker's contention that the Folio is in a position analogous to that of a contaminated manuscript of an author such as Juvenal. That the 'nearness of the print to autograph' in Shakespeare makes a great deal of difference in practice is undisputed.

It is one of Mr. Bowers's qualities to stimulate argument and speculation in his readers. This review demonstrates his success in one instance. The debate will certainly continue. J. C. MAXWELL

New Readings in Shakespeare. By C. J. SISSON. Vol. I, pp. x + 218; Vol. II, pp. viii + 300 (Shakespeare Problems Series. General Editor: J. DOVER WILSON). Cambridge: University Press, 1956. 45*s.* net.

In these two volumes Professor Sisson discusses 'some of the principal suggestions made in recent years for the clarification of difficult and doubtful passages in Shakespeare's text'. The volumes thus provide a commentary not only on his own edition, published in 1954, but also on the work of his immediate predecessors—notably Dover Wilson, Kittredge, and Alexander.

The readings discussed affect the dialogue (including its punctuation), locality headings, speech prefixes, and stage directions, though rather strangely the 'new readings' do not include all the new readings in Mr. Sisson's own text: e.g. 'dedicate', following Ritson and Steevens, *Tp.*, I. ii. 89; 'amity and league', following S. Walker and Dyce, *Mer.V.*, III. ii. 30; 'the gentleman', following F1, *2H4*, I. i. 55. I should have thought that these, and similar readings which run counter to normal practice, were more worth discussion than, for instance, 'life-harming', *R2*, II. ii. 3, where the correctness of Q1 is not in dispute. Further, in the new readings chosen for discussion, that an earlier editor had reached the same conclusion is sometimes overlooked: e.g. the (old) Cambridge edition records 'bull-baiting', *Wiv.*, II. ii. 29, as Hanmer's reading; 'venom'd', *R2*, II. i. 19, as Pope's; 'lost', *Cor.*, I. iv. 54, as Collier's and Singer's. In this way *New Readings* is unsystematic, and it is even at times misleading: that 'most editors' reject Theobald's emendation in *Gent.*, II. iv. 116, seems to me contrary to the facts, and although, in his Introduction, Mr. Sisson writes disarmingly of the risks of such oversights they impair the usefulness of his work.

What ultimately matters, of course, is not whether readings are new but whether they are true to Shakespeare's intentions and, as it is manifestly impossible for any reviewer to consider individually the readings Mr. Sisson discusses, since they number about eleven hundred, what I judge to be the most profitable course is to provide readers with some means of weighing the pros and cons of the arguments for themselves. I shall therefore, in what follows, try to avoid particularities (except for purposes of illustration) and confine myself to questions of policy, because without agreement on editorial principles discussion is aimless and there can be no end to differences of opinion.

As regards Mr. Sisson's policy, I very much doubt whether preoccupation with recent work provides the best means of achieving either useful or lasting results. Every editor must, of course, take full account of the work of the past, including that of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries, profiting by

their successes and taking warning from their misfortunes. But opinions change, and the work of a contemporary is particularly unstable ground for serious debate since he may have withdrawn from a position he once held—just as, indeed, Mr. Sisson himself occasionally retracts a reading of his edition published only three years ago. There is nothing strange in this, and it is particularly liable to happen today when so much work of fundamental importance to Shakespeare studies is in progress that any contribution to textual matters may need revision, through no fault of its author, by the time it is published. Both on general principles and in the particular conditions now prevailing, I should therefore have liked to see less concern about the readings of recent editions (and especially those of the New Cambridge Shakespeare, whose pioneering volumes appeared more than thirty years ago) and more recognition of the implications of work in progress, like Hinman's work on the First Folio.

I doubt too whether it is profitable to argue the pros and cons of readings on their merits without taking into account what each decision implies for the readings of the text in question as a whole and, indeed, the whole corpus of Shakespeare's works. Lack of co-ordination can only lead to inconsistencies in assumption between one reading and another and between one text and another. An example of this danger is provided by some of Mr. Sisson's strictures on emendation in the interests of metre. He accepts in his text of *Hamlet* as many as a hundred F1 readings which the Q2 compositors seemingly omitted by accident. Thus we have—the italicized words are imported from F1—:

> Do you think '*tis* this?
> Thus conscience does make cowards *of us all*
> Give us the foils. *Come on.*

No editor who accepts, *inter alia*, the above F1 readings, pursuing (quite rightly) the like policy in other texts for which we have collateral authorities (e.g. *2 Henry IV*, *Troilus and Cressida*) can logically argue that editors who suspect lacunae in texts for which we have a single authority have found a mare's nest and that defective lines, given that the sense is complete, are lines as Shakespeare wrote them. This would mean that Shakespeare wrote a more regular metre in plays for which we have (by chance) collateral texts and a poorer sort in plays for which we have (unfortunately) a single authority. That an editor should sometimes hesitate between rival emendations aimed at restoring the metre is understandable; but it is not understandable that he should postulate compositors' omissions in some texts and reject the possibility of lacunae in others.

In some measure, this lack of consistency in assumption (of which metre is but one example) is due to taking too restricted a view of the causes of error in transmission. What most interests Mr. Sisson as the solvent of textual difficulties is the *ductus literarum*, and here what he has to offer on the constructive side is often valuable. But a consideration of the readings which are perforce emended in recent editions (including his own) shows that most of the errors in Shakespearian texts set from manuscript were due to the kind of accident that is abundantly exemplified in reprints, where there was no possibility of misreading. Most compositors were prone, for instance, to omit letters, syllables, words, and

phrases; to interpolate words and letters; and to assimilate a word to a neighbouring one. Hence, an editor who perforce corrects 'Lamention' to 'lamentation', *Cor.*, IV. vi. 34, cannot dismiss Theobald's emendation of 'things' to 'thwartings', *Cor.*, III. ii. 21, simply for lack of support from the *ductus literarum*, especially when it is supported by 'cross you' two lines later; nor in *Antony and Cleopatra*, having to emend 'composion' to 'composition' at II. vi. 59, need he make a mountain out of a molehill when he finds 'lacking' for 'lackeying' at I. iv. 46. Contrariwise, though less frequently, a compositor might interpolate: 'notice' for 'note', *Tit.*, II. iii. 85, where Mr. Sisson rejects the possibility of a compositor's error (in spite of F3's having made the same mistake in *2H4*, II. ii. 17), is probably due to assimilation ('not*ice* of *this*'); that 'note' is wanted is shown by the next line. Assimilation similarly perverts the sense of the Q reading (which he accepts) in *2H4*, I. i. 125–6, 'Then was that noble Worcester *So soon* ta'en prisoner' (F 'Too soon'), and it is illogical to reject the F1 reading because of the unlikelihood that Q's error was one of misreading. It should not be forgotten that if an editor accepts Q as correct, he is not out of the wood: he still has to explain how the error which he postulates in F arose. Q's 'So soon' is here on a par with Q's '*S*ets *s*hut our gates', *Troil.*, II. ii. 47, and here Mr. Sisson follows F ('Let 's shut'), presumably because Q's reading is manifestly nonsense. But do we want texts of Shakespeare from which only the grossest errors have been removed? Confidence in the *ductus literarum* should not blind an editor's eyes to what is patently required in the interests of sense and style, and the struggles to evict Theobald's 'page', *Mer.V.*, II. i. 35, should serve as a warning. Even careless sorting of type will not always result in errors like 'mote' for 'more' or 'ptayers' for 'prayers' in *Antony and Cleopatra*, and if an editor finds himself compelled to suppose that to 'beat' the 'holding' is as sensible a reading as to 'bear' the 'holding' (*Ant.*, II. vii. 117), simply because misreading of 'r' as 't' is unlikely, then it is as well to remember that 'r' and 't' errors are among the commonest due to foul case in the First Folio. I stress these possibilities not merely because of their importance in evaluating Mr. Sisson's notes but also because so long as any editor fails to establish principles which he can observe consistently we shall have not fewer differences of opinion but more.

In his Introduction, Mr. Sisson explains the way in which he approached his task. He writes that he is 'convinced that the true starting-point for such labours is the approximation to a *tabula rasa* . . . to ensure an unprejudiced approach', subsequently taking into account the work of past editors and current research. An unprejudiced approach on these lines seems to me quite impossible. Everyone who edits Shakespeare starts with some preconceptions fostered by literary training and with some knowledge of the history of Shakespearian textual criticism. These cannot be razed from the table of memory and to attempt to start with a clean slate only incurs the risk of muddling through. Personal predilections can only be corrected by analysing at the outset the emendations made by earlier editors which are unavoidable and by relating these to the variants in reprints and collateral texts. If an editor knows, for instance, that Q's 'repured', *Troil.*, III. ii. 23, is right and F's 'reputed' wrong, he will bring a steadier judgement to bear on Theobald's 'bear' for 'beat' in *Antony and Cleopatra*.

This lack of consistent editorial principles is what users of these volumes should bear in mind when they weigh Mr. Sisson's conclusions. They must ask themselves what some of his *obiter dicta* imply for what he postulates about the copy for some Folio texts (e.g. his notes on *R3*, I. iii. 109, *Tit.*, IV. iv. 62, *Lr.*, I. ii. 20–21)—an important matter which I have not dealt with here since it seems to crop up only occasionally in *New Readings*—and they must ask themselves what each emendation he accepts or rejects implies for another. They will probably find, as I do, that there are many that deserve serious attention (though they are not strictly 'new') and they will find that many are prompted by false reasoning, due to an unsystematic approach to the problems of transmission. The book will presumably be used mainly by other editors and a methodical consideration of the problems will show in most cases where the truth lies.

ALICE WALKER

Shakespeares Dramatische Konzeption. By RICHARD LAQUEUR. Pp. viii + 356. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1955. DM. 22.

All Shakespeare's plays, according to this new disintegrating study, were revised (p. 12), but, though he altered their time-schemes in nearly every case while recasting their plots (p. 19), Shakespeare never tried to bring the earlier version of a play into line with the later conception, adding new material without checking whether it would make nonsense of other parts (pp. 21, 28, 36, &c.). Consequently it is possible, in Mr. Laqueur's view, to reconstruct the original story of a Shakespearian play by grouping together those inconsistencies which seem to be dictated by a superseded purpose.

It must be admitted that this painstaking examination is impressive, with its lists of different kinds of inconsistency, many of which are noted for the first time. (If the examples which are not new had been acknowledged this would have been a help, for references to other critics are strikingly few.) Yet a large number of these newly suggested contradictions will be found unconvincing. False concords are too common in Elizabethan drama to be allowed to serve in Mr. Laqueur's lists (p. 26); the use of different names for one character, again, requires no special explanation (p. 51). And too often the interpretation of individual passages leaves the reader gasping. In *Macbeth* I. vi are found the signs of an erotic relationship between Duncan and Lady Macbeth (pp. 208 ff.), therefore the air 'Smells wooingly here', and therefore Lady Macbeth entered 'das Gemach des im Bett liegenden Koenigs'; and an indication of an earlier version is even detected in the 'inconsistency' of the two explanations of Lady Macbeth's bell (II. i. 31–32, 62–64).

The chapter on *Othello* may be taken as representative of the two-sidedness of the whole book. Adopting the familiar hypothesis that Cassio was Desdemona's lover in Venice, Mr. Laqueur dwells on the inner coherence of the two different time-schemes, with some new observations. Thus the assertions of Cassio's knowledge of Othello's suit (III. iii. 70–73, 99–100), and of his ignorance of it

(I. ii. 52), are very probably bound up with the clashing time-schemes in Cyprus. But could Desdemona possibly have meant Cassio (p. 82) when she hinted that Othello's story would woo her if he 'had a friend that loved her' (I. iii. 164)? Can Desdemona's '"Tis meet I should be used so, very meet' (IV. ii. 107) be regarded as a confession of guilt—when the very next lines give the lie to such a literal reading?

No consideration of Shakespeare's art can afford to ignore his inconsistencies, the sign-posts to his unique methods of compression and foreshortening. When Mr. Laqueur observes (p. 218) that the night of Duncan's murder is said to have been 'dreadful' and 'sore' (*Macbeth* II. iv. 3), i.e. noisy, but was in fact shown to be absolutely peaceful (in II. ii), anyone who had overlooked this discrepancy will be grateful. But must we resign ourselves to a revision-theory as the only possible explanation? Even if Professor Schücking's idea of 'episodic intensification' is rejected as an alternative we may still argue that, in the ordinary course of composition, his concentration on essentials made Shakespeare blunder with inessentials—as in the instance pointed out by Ben Jonson.

E. A. J. HONIGMANN

The Mutual Flame. On Shakespeare's *Sonnets* and *The Phoenix and the Turtle*. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. Pp. xii+234. London: Methuen, 1955. 18*s*. net.

Perhaps more than any other writer Mr. Wilson Knight has shaped the contemporary approach to Shakespeare, not only by prompting new insights into individual plays but by widening and deepening our conception of the kind of experience that the plays offer; so that many of us who find ourselves in disagreement with him on important matters retain a sense of gratitude and indebtedness. Yet disagreement, where it exists at all, is bound to be sharp, for it cannot be confined to particular differences of interpretation; it has to take account of a radical defect of method, of critical vices that have grown up with the critical virtues, curiously distorting what is valid, discomforting Mr. Knight's early admirers, and likely to confirm the unsympathetic in a dazed hostility. *The Mutual Flame* faces the reviewer with a difficult task.

In the Sonnets Mr. Knight sees the beginning of the creative process that found expression in the plays. Loved Youth and Dark Lady are 'real people' who focus for Shakespeare large tracts of experience, and, simultaneously, aspects of Shakespeare's soul for which Mr. Knight uses the Nietzschean terms of Apollonian and Dionysian respectively. In exploring his relationship with these two, therefore, Shakespeare is exploring his own psyche, and the Sonnets are 'a semi-dramatic expression of a clearly defined process of integration, pointing towards the realization of a high state of being' (p. 23). In this drama it is the Youth who plays the leading role. As the object of a passionate friendship he inevitably prompts an urgent questioning of the status of values in a world of time and change, and in the chapter on 'Time and Eternity' Mr. Knight says some admirable things about the way in which the stresses within a particular and limited experience, when fully and honestly responded to, transform that

experience into something of far wider scope and deeper import. 'The Sonnets offer no easy assurances' (p. 70), but it is in the process of writing them that Shakespeare reaches forward towards the apprehension of values transcending time which as yet, in the Sonnets, elude definition. The young man, however, is not only a representative and symbol of beauty in a world of change; Shakespeare glimpses in him the 'bi-sexual' integration towards which his own nature —partly feminine, because creative—is striving; by projecting on to the youth his own latent powers Shakespeare becomes conscious of them:

> The drama of these sonnets may accordingly be known as a workshop, 'the quick forge and working-house of thought' of *Henry V*, widening out to that specific integration, or wholeness, from which the plays were composed. (p. 34)

That heightened and more inclusive consciousness was first prompted by devotion to a particular person; if, in the light of that ampler consciousness, the particular person comes to seem inadequate (hence the sonnets of apology and excuse) the love itself is not so much changed as expanded; it is in remaining true to himself and to his creative task that the poet is most true to that original experience which, by assimilating it, he necessarily outgrew. In the haunting poem, 'The Phoenix and the Turtle', Mr. Knight finds 'a condensed miniature of our whole story' (p. 140). The Turtle (male, but with feminine qualities) is the creative poet; the Phoenix (female, but with suggestions of masculine and royal power) is love and beauty and indeed all that inspires the poet; whilst 'the bird of loudest lay' is 'the new Phoenix' of imaginative creation springing from the mystical death in love of the two highly symbolical birds.[1]

Now it does seem to me true that the main interest of the Sonnets, if we consider them as a whole and not simply as a collection of some very beautiful, some very puzzling, and some indifferent poems, lies in their relation to the more developed creative process that they point towards. They are at the heart or starting-place (it depends on how we date them) of the experience recorded in the plays. It is also, I think, true that some of the deeper meanings connecting with the plays are not directly expressed but 'resounding within' the Sonnets (p. 100): 'things are continually being suggested beyond the superficial thought-moulds that contain them' (p. 89). Yet, seeing all this so clearly, Mr. Knight offers us no more than (to use his own phrase) 'stabs of insight' in a book that, taken as a whole, seems curiously irrelevant to a living interest in the poetry: the effect is as though the excitement of a discovery that is partly, at least, a genuine discovery, had dissipated itself in words.

The difficulty is to explain why, with a critic of Mr. Knight's perceptiveness, this should be so. It is partly, of course, because there are so incredibly many

[1] Mr. Knight finds support for his by no means clear symbolic interpretation not only in the verses by Marston, Jonson, and Chapman which accompany Shakespeare's poem (all alike, he claims, being concerned with 'the psychology of poetic creation' (p. 179)), but in Chester's *Love's Martyr*, the long poem to which the 'Divers Poetical Essays on the Turtle and the Phoenix' are a supplement. I have not read *Love's Martyr*, but on the evidence that Mr. Knight supplies, his interpretations seem extremely forced.

references to other works by Mr. Wilson Knight. Such elaborate cross-referencing could only be justified if Mr. Knight were writing a closely reasoned treatise on theology or philosophy, which he is not. When this bad habit is associated with the too-frequent use of a set of specialized descriptive terms the effect is claustrophobic. Moreover, Mr. Knight relies heavily on a method that has always formed part of his critical procedure, namely the accumulation of words and phrases from the poetry to establish underlying meanings that may not anywhere be expressed directly. Used with caution in the interpretation of the greater plays, where the imaginative pressure is not in question, this method may give valuable promptings. Applied to the Sonnets it can be quite misleading, for it begs the all-important question of the quality, the imaginative vitality, of individual poems: you can extract words and phrases to invest with significance as easily from an indifferent sonnet as from a good one. Sonnet 42 ('That thou hast her, it is not all my grief . . .') is a bad sonnet, frigid, mechanical, and unconvincing, but Mr. Knight calls it in evidence as though it were genuine poetry:

> If his mistress loves his friend, it scarcely matters, since he and his friend are 'one' (42). He is 'all the better part of me' (39). The unity expressed is that of Romeo's, 'It is my soul that calls upon my name' . . .; of Viola's 'call upon my soul within the house' . . .; or Cathy's words in *Wuthering Heights*, 'I am Heathcliff'. (p. 42)

In dealing with the plays, moreover, the method of verbal accumulation is checked and controlled by larger patterns of meaning: in applying it to the Sonnets, where meanings are difficult and elusive, there is an obvious danger of erecting a structure of meaning that is to some extent extraneous to the poetry. To treat even the more highly charged words, or symbols, as 'existent powers in their own right *irrespective of*, though of course never contradicting, *their particular contexts*' (p. 59: my italics) is to open the door to a wholesale importation of an abstract, generalizing philosophy. The philosophy of creative integration that Mr. Knight propounds, reduced to essentials, does I suppose apply to any artist, and Mr. Knight may be right in finding it, or something like it, in the Sonnets. The trouble is that in its more dithyrambic forms it thrives on a blurring of distinctions[1] so that the pursuit of it becomes not only different from but incompatible with the responsive submission (at once disciplined and creative, free yet concentrated on the precise and particular) that poetry demands. My complaint about this book is that in it Mr. Knight is not content to prompt new insights, he is propaganding for (one is tempted to say) 'my system'. What should have been a perceptive essay has been expanded into a book which demands and encourages quite the wrong kind of attention. L. C. KNIGHTS

[1] As Mr. Knight says of the Dionysian-Apollonian antithesis, 'These are inexhaustible categories: once you understand them, you find them everywhere' (p. 27). You do indeed.

Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution. By WILLIAM HALLER. Pp. xvi + 410. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1955. 48*s.* net.

This is the second of Professor Haller's two monumental volumes on English Puritanism. The first, *The Rise of Puritanism*, appeared in 1938; it gave an account of the ideas expressed by Puritan preachers and writers from the time of the Elizabethan settlement to the breakdown of episcopal authority in the early days of the Long Parliament. The present volume carries the story from 1640 to 1649. Mr. Haller is an historian of ideas, but not of ideas isolated from their political and social context. He is concerned to show what happened to Puritan thought as a result of the situations Puritans found themselves in during the period under consideration; 'the interplay of ideas and experience' is important to him. So this book is neither a work of intellectual history nor a retelling of the familiar story of king versus parliament in the 1640's. It is an account and an explanation of how Puritan thinking responded to the series of crises which began with the summoning of parliament in 1640.

It should be said at once that Mr. Haller carries out his task with brilliant success. Learned, perceptive, always in full control of his material, never exhibitionist or merely pedantic, he is continuously informative and illuminating. He first considers what happened when the 'godly preaching ministry' were given their head as a result of the Long Parliament's cutting loose from royal and episcopal authority. He examines the arguments developed by the preachers and shows how, often without realizing it, they raised questions of Church government, and so of government in the state, which went much farther than those which they or parliament had been seriously prepared to consider. When the preachers found themselves suddenly free to speak out, 'the thought uppermost in their minds was to make certain not of ultimate command but of present freedom, not how to reconstruct and control the ecclesiastical state but how to promote preaching and protect and advance the preaching order'. The Root and Branch Petition of 11 December 1640 talked in its preamble about the necessity of abolishing the government of the Church as constituted 'with all its dependencies, rootes and branches' and the setting up in its place of 'government, according to Gods word', but neither petitioners nor preachers were at first concerned to define 'government, according to Gods word'. Mr. Haller goes on to show how under the stress of events preachers and pamphleteers were led towards definition, yet how parliament and the Westminster Assembly never committed themselves to a specific ecclesiastical system and in the end left a legacy of variety and individualism to the English nonconformist tradition.

Mr. Haller's second chapter discusses the debate on the nature of the English reformation, its past and its future, which was the wider context of the debate on episcopacy. His third gives an account of ideas on natural law, on contract, and on the origin and ends of government which Puritan writers were led to develop by the political situation which their ecclesiastical views had helped to precipitate. These two chapters are of the first importance for the literary student, especially for the student of Milton. All too often discussions of Milton's thought are

presented in isolation from the political and theological writing of his time. Mr. Haller shows with clarity and precision where Milton agrees with the Puritan thought of his day. It often turns out to be at just those points which critics of Milton have long been accustomed to cite as evidence of Milton's quaintly naïve egotism. 'Now once again by all concurrence of signs, and by the generall instinct of holy and devout men, . . . God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in his Church, ev'n to the reforming of Reformation it self: what does he then but reveal Himself to his servants, and as his manner is, first to his English-men.' How often have we seen this passage from *Areopagitica* quoted as evidence of Milton's egotistical utopianism! But this view was a commonplace of Puritan preaching. And the account which Milton gives in *Of Reformation in England* of the special part played by England in initiating the recovery of the Church was equally familiar. The view that England had preserved in some degree the pure worship of the early Church even in the most corrupt period of the Middle Ages was freely expressed by English Protestants. Mr. Haller might have pointed out that when Archbishop Parker began Anglo-Saxon scholarship in England with his publication in 1567 of *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, an Easter Day sermon of Ælfric's directed against transubstantiation and quoting the Lord's Prayer and other central biblical passages in Anglo-Saxon, his aim had also been to demonstrate that the English Church had from the beginning been independent of Rome, and 'pure'.

Mr. Haller also puts Milton's divorce pamphlets into their proper context and shows us the relation between the view of marriage expressed by Milton and the view of marriage as spiritual communion expressed by the Puritan preachers. He also links Milton's arguments about divorce with the arguments on the nature of kingship and magistracy which Milton was later to develop. Marriage is a contract, a covenant, entered into to achieve a specific end; and if the end is not achieved, the contract falls to the ground and a new one can be entered into. 'Thus the same law of covenant and renewal of covenant, which Parker and the defenders of parliament against the king were asserting as the basis of the state, Milton was putting forward as the true basis of marriage or the state in little.' Milton does not, however, emerge from Mr. Haller's treatment as a lesser figure because of the ideas, once thought to be his own, which he is now seen to have shared with others. On the contrary, the true nature of his contribution emerges much more strongly and clearly. Indeed, this book is required reading for anyone who wishes fully to understand and appreciate Milton's prose writings on episcopacy and reformation, divorce, freedom of the press, and the relation between the ruler and the ruled.

The fourth chapter discusses some of the problems and difficulties facing the divines assembled at Westminster; it includes an admirable account of the differences, historical, theoretical, and practical, between English and Scottish Presbyterianism. The whole context of the Presbyterian versus Independent conflict is here succinctly and luminously presented. Chapter V gives an account of arguments for and against freedom of speech, putting *Areopagitica* in proper perspective. The remaining five chapters show the development of conflicting ideas within the army, among Puritan divines and thinkers at large, among the

Levellers, and elsewhere, with a particularly helpful section on the army, parliament, and the Levellers, and their mutual relations.

Mr. Haller's book is in the best traditions of American scholarship. Together with its predecessor it provides an account of English Puritan thought in relation to the events of the time which looks as though it will long remain classic. It should be compulsory reading among university students of both English and History, for it challenges the glib formulations so often received as truth and provides a thoroughly documented and well-reasoned account of one of the great germinating periods of English thought. It is written with vigour and clarity, and is a pleasure to read.

DAVID DAICHES

The Levellers. A History of the Writings of Three Seventeenth-Century Social Democrats: John Lilburne, Richard Overton, William Walwyn. By JOSEPH FRANK. Pp. x+346. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1955. 40*s.* net.

This book will prove a useful addition to recent work on the Levellers by W. Schenk, Don M. Wolfe, W. Haller, P. Zagorin, and the earlier classical study by A. S. P. Woodhouse in *Puritanism and Liberty*. By means of quotation and summary, though without reproducing any of the pamphlets in full, Mr. Frank describes the progress of the Leveller campaign for Agreements of the People month by month during the critical half-dozen years from 1645 to 1651. At the same time, by means of a detailed study of the life and works of the three chief authors of the movement in their total span, the book provides useful indications of the historical sources of the Leveller ideology and of its eventual deflux into the streams of late seventeenth-century Deism, Quakerism, and the rest.

The Bibliography is valuable and, in a way, comprehensive. Of course, that part devoted to the Leveller pamphlets themselves will (for the student who wishes to do further research in this field) scarcely supersede the Catalogue of the Thomason Tracts published by the British Museum, but it will provide a useful starting-point.

When one looks for Mr. Frank's central thesis, however, one has a slight sense of regret that a book of such meticulous scholarship should be dedicated to nothing more than the proposition that the present-day reader (especially the American reader, one supposes) 'would find himself excitingly and alarmingly at home in the political and intellectual ferment of the English Civil War'. There is, of course, a clear resemblance between the activities of certain committees of the American Senate at the present day and the proceedings of the judicial committees of the Long Parliament and the Rump at various times against Overton and Lilburne. And the refusal of the latter to take oaths or to give evidence of a self-incriminating kind so obviously recalls the conduct of American left-wingers struggling with the Fifth Amendment that a present-day American academic can hardly be blamed for pressing the analogy home. There is even, no doubt, an historical link between the democratic idealism thrown up by the Puritan

Revolution in England and that born out of the similar ideological conditions of New England at the time of the American Revolution. The cry of 'no taxation without representation' almost echoes Rainsborough's demands at Putney in 1647 and similar statements by Lilburne in 1646. When all this has been said, however, one cannot help wondering whether the modern social democrat would find himself very much at home in the *religious* climate of Interregnum politics; for it must be stressed that in spite of the secular sanctions they sometimes invoked (the Stoic Law of Nature, Magna Carta, &c.), the Levellers owed their inspiration, if not the content of their ideas, chiefly to their Puritan sense of election and mission.

The present-day democrat would hardly appreciate, for instance, the significance of Walwyn's spiritual conflict in which the Law and the Gospel struggled for mastery, nor would he be anything but embarrassed if he heard one of his leaders declare, like Lilburne, that 'God hath chosen me freely before the foundation of the world was laid'. We may question also whether the present-day liberal would appreciate the cogency of Lilburne's appeal to the doctrine of the creation of Adam in the Divine Image as the source for the special worth and sanctity of every individual man and woman. It may be that this Hebrew teaching of the *imago dei* is the genuine tap-root of all European revolutionary democracy; but with the Levellers the Biblical source was recognized, thus providing the emotional atmosphere for their programme and colouring (especially in the case of Overton) their style of writing: with the modern democrat it has passed beneath (or beyond) the level of consciousness. Indeed, to get a true picture of the situation, an attempt must be made to isolate the special brand of religious activism which makes of Overton so curious a complex of saint, martyr, and demagogue; and this can only be done by using the theological categories of the Levellers themselves. In this respect, the work of Schenk, *The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution* (1948), whilst less comprehensive (as regards the Levellers) and less informed than the work under review, is sustained by a more convincing and coherent thesis.

Mr. Frank is more reliable than the earlier writers in this field, however, in his sense of the literary context and quality of the Leveller pamphlets. His remarks on the different styles of these writers are suggestive: he notes Overton's raciness which links him with Nashe on the one hand, and his strain of irony which links him with Swift on the other; Walwyn's more moderate tone and limpid phraseology; Lilburne's vigour and bluntness. In general their contribution to the literature of political debate and to the growth of popular journalism is well indicated. As Mr. Frank justly intimates, Overton is the most skilful and effective prose-writer of the three, with a gift of graphic imagery and a capacity to employ a colourful rhetoric where necessary in defence of his rights and those of the oppressed classes of the land.

In a useful appendix, Mr. Frank awards the authorship of the disputed *Mans Mortallitie* (1644) to the Leveller Richard Overton in preference to Robert Overton, Milton's known friend, and sometime Governor of Hull. This seems to be the main tendency of recent discussion, though possibly the final word has not been said on this point. But the significance of the pamphlet for Milton

studies is the same whichever Overton was the author. Saurat has shown (*Milton, Man and Thinker*, 2nd edn. 1944) that the pamphlet bears a close resemblance at many points to Milton's ideas as expressed in the *De Doctrina Christiana*, and has suggested that Milton helped to revise 'R.O.''s pamphlet for the second edition of 1655. In his discussion of the mortalist heresy, Mr. Frank indeed mentions Milton but not (surprisingly) the *De Doctrina Christiana*. Nor does Saurat's book gain admission to the text or the Bibliography. This is a regrettable omission in a book otherwise well documented and produced with a pleasing attention to detail.

HAROLD FISCH

An Anatomy of Milton's Verse. By W. B. C. WATKINS. Pp. xii + 151. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1955. $3.00.

Many will agree that it is time that something should be said, along the lines indicated in Mr. Watkins's preface, to and for those who would modestly style themselves the ordinary readers of Milton. The intention to concentrate on the poetry and especially on its sensuous and passionate qualities (he has less to say on its relative 'simplicity') is promising, though not what would be expected from the title which is hardly saved by introductory explanations. 'Anatomy' suggests something more, not less, analytic than what is provided, and in all respects in which a distinction can be made the critic is to be found occupied with poetry rather than verse. But in spite of the title the book is made up of three essays, on Sensation, Creation, and Temptation. In the first abundant evidence is cited to show the vividness of Milton's sense impressions. What it discloses is not at all new, but much of it is true and well worth attention. On occasions Mr. Watkins would have it that Milton's sensuousness can and should be called sensuality. This seems very dubious and involves straining terms. The endeavour to neglect nothing leads to some forced points, but not more, perhaps, than are inevitable when phrases are italicized in grand and complex passages. The essays on Creation and Temptation broach harder matters and here and there damage is done by isolating a theory, such as the general relation between reason and passion in Milton's work, pursuing it in and out of poems which have their own proper purposes and forms. In the last section there is the quicksand of a distaste for *Comus* and a distrust of the virtue it celebrates and the more evident rock of antagonism to *Paradise Regained*. These prejudices are common enough but they darken understanding. What Mr. Watkins writes about the poetry that appeals to him is usually so cogent that it seems a pity that he should work up admiration for the treatment of the temptation of Eve, Adam, and Samson by disparaging contrasts. If he can stand so firmly for Milton's 'fine though limited dramatic instinct' in *Paradise Lost* why will he not at least give benefit of the doubt that the same instinct is at work in contriving the debates of *Paradise Regained* and is sensitive to the demands made by the imagined situations in which first the Lady and later Christ are found? Why refuse to allow that a poem about temptation may really tempt? It is dangerous and misleading to disregard the form of the Masque and the purpose of the brief Epic.

I have the impression, though I know well enough how deceptive impression can be, that the book was composed a little hastily. Infinitives are split without any apparent advantage; there are some *non sequiturs*; some puns are not as good as they should be to be there at all; some footnotes are rather loosely related to the text; a couple of passages are open to misconstruction because of cutting (pp. 131, 144), and some lines of the chorus are attributed to Samson (p. 137); on p. 46 'marsh' left for 'marish' spoils a fine line. To compensate, the style has some of the properties of candid talk and it may be reckoned as a merit that each essay provokes thought and is refreshingly undogmatic. It is a completely unpretentious little book with many insights and a few obtusenesses.

K. M. LEA

Personification in Eighteenth-Century English Poetry. By CHESTER F. CHAPIN. Pp. x+176. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1955. 24*s*. net.

In poetry, experience lives; 'imitating' life and nature, the poet creates them. So we always say, and so said John Hughes's *Essay on Allegorical Poetry* (1715)—

> The power of raising Images or Resemblances of things, giving them Life and Action, and presenting them as it were before the Eyes, was thought to have something in it like Creation.

Poetry's metaphors and images are sensory and often animated; indeed, Mr. D. G. James has argued (Mr. Chapin quotes him), abstract as language sometimes appears, an acute enough introspection might detect it always working through the senses. Human nature seems driven to personify its concepts; a human and intellectual life is transferred to them from the poet's own spirit, and in this sense we are all poets. Democracy, Tyranny, Justice, Truth, Love, and Death affect us as real existences.

The argument should help to rehabilitate eighteenth-century personification. If it helps only partially, that is because, as Mr. Chapin admits, the poetry in which personification is bad is bad poetry; the abstractions haunting the minor verse, especially the crepuscular kind (their fluid bodies half-dissolved in twilight), are a tiresome convention. But if there are too many rosy Pleasures, musing Melancholies, and pensive Silences (not to mention Erasmus Darwin's BOTANIC MUSE, NYMPHS OF PRIMEVAL FIRE, FIEND OF FROST, and 'SOLSTICE stalking through the sick'ning bowers'), it is as well to be reminded of merits as well as defects, of the historic situation, and indeed of a relationship to our whole mode of conceiving. To do this is one of the several useful functions of this book, a thorough and methodical study which naturally tries to gain a sympathetic understanding of its subject yet is not uncritical of it.

The book's weaknesses lie in presentation rather than in substance, and they are not grave. It is too faithfully an academic thesis to provide lively reading, and there is—as in many books of the kind—too much citation of other workers in the field, so that 132 pages of text require 421 annotations. This scrupulousness not to claim for oneself anything, however ordinary the idea or phrasing,

that might be attributable to others is an exaggeration of honesty which diminishes the personal impact scholarship should make.

Yet honesty, even exaggerated, is a virtue, and it is combined here with orderly exposition and a sound perception of what the subject needs. Leaving aside some kinds of personification (those of natural objects), Mr. Chapin concentrates on those of mental or moral qualities and abstract ideas. In the 1800 *Preface* Wordsworth spoke of the poet as 'carrying sensation into the midst of the objects of the science itself'. That was one aim of personification, in an age falling progressively under a mechanistic philosophy. Another was to demonstrate the poet's transcendental powers of imagination. Both these aims fall within Mr. Chapin's first category—that of the allegorical-descriptive figure. Other aims, of condensing moral observations in terse embodiments, as Johnson does, or of animating moral commentary by graphic characterization, as Pope does, or of brightening a psychological situation with a dramatic flash, as does, say, Isaac Watts's

> Lively bright Horror, and amazing Anguish
> Stare through their Eye-lids—

these are his second category, that of personification as metaphor, the vehicle intimately expressing the idea. These distinctions, valuable though not always clear, are carried through an examination of the prosopopoeia in Collins and Gray, Darwin and Wordsworth, Johnson and Pope.

Mr. Chapin, then, has some sense of poetic inwardness in analysing his figure; he also carefully and soundly plots its historical affiliations. Much was due to biblical and classical precedent, much to the prestige of moral philosophy (moral prosopopoeia, Mr. Chapin shrewdly argues, is effective in ages when moral qualities are thought objectively real). More immediately influential were the examples of Milton and of the visual arts. And as the very grounds of repute, there was the empiricism of Hobbes and Locke which held the senses to be the source of knowledge and the sight to be the most informative of the senses. Mr. Chapin digs the ground effectively and commendably and roots his central subject firmly in tradition and its contemporary circumstances.

A. R. HUMPHREYS

The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift. Vol. XII. Irish Tracts 1728–1733. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS. Pp. xlviii+358. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. 21*s.* net.

When Swift returned to Ireland in September 1727 after his final visit to England, his triumphs with the *Drapier's Letters* and *Gulliver's Travels* were behind him and he faced the years ahead with growing despondency. Though revered among the common people as Ireland's leading patriot, he often came near to despair as he saw how little could be done to ameliorate the lot of the Irish, a situation made worse by the terrible years of hardship and famine then upon them. But it was not in his nature to accept defeat, and in the ten years of writing and public activity that still remained to him, he never entirely abandoned his attempts, hopeless as he saw them to be, to teach the Irish some practical wisdom and to urge them to action in defence of their true interests.

The latest volume of Mr. Herbert Davis's splendid edition of Swift's prose prints the tracts that he wrote in this cause between the years 1728 and 1733. It includes also the pieces that he prepared as a curb upon the Irish bishops when in 1731–2 they sought to encroach upon the rights of the inferior clergy, and his pamphlets against the Presbyterians when, shortly afterwards, they caused fresh alarm by renewed agitation for the repeal of the Test and looked like getting decisive support from the government.

For the general reader of Swift these pieces have been among the least attractive of his writings, partly of course for the reason that there is no widespread interest in the history of Ireland, but also because only one of them, the *Modest Proposal*, is a work of major literary status. For the history of Ireland they are certainly of first-rate importance because of Swift's realistic appraisal of the miserable state of the country and the practical improvements he proposed, themselves grounded upon a comprehensive reading of the economic theories of the day and an independent realization that the current maxims had to be 'controlled', i.e. modified, when applied to the peculiar conditions of Ireland. In this respect Davis's introduction is most helpful in setting these pieces in the context of contemporary events and theories. Even so there are many points of detail on which the modern reader would welcome further enlightenment in the form of annotations of the kind that Dr. Irvin Ehrenpreis has supplied for Swift's writing on English politics in his recent edition of *An Enquiry into the Behavior of the Queen's Last Ministry*. The exclusion of this form of commentary from the scope of Davis's edition is the one feature in which it is less helpful than the older edition of Temple Scott, which in all other respects it now supersedes. A consolidated index to the whole of the prose, which is promised for the final volume of this edition, will remove some of the difficulty. As it is, the present volume prepares the way for a comprehensive study of Swift's part in the political and economic development of Ireland comparable to that which L. A. Landa has written on Swift and the Church of Ireland. Here, for example, is clear evidence of the way in which Swift and Archbishop King, despite their opposite political attachments, co-operated in Ireland's cause (pp. 75, 121, 201); the historian, moreover, must carefully weigh Swift's analysis of the effect of the Revolution on Ireland (pp. 132–3), the root causes of his detestation of the Presbyterians, and the justifications he makes for fearing them more than the Papists (pp. 257–8, 263) as a menace to the stability of the state as well as the established church. These are all fundamental considerations for the understanding of Swift's personal attitudes and political principles, as also for the history of Ireland.

Nor should the literary interest of these occasional writings be underestimated. Swift's powers as an author were not in decline and much of his finest poetry was written during these same years, notably *The Grand Question Debated*, *The Journal of a Modern Lady*, *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift*, *The Day of Judgement*, and *On Poetry, A Rapsody*. His prose of this period, with the one exception of *A Modest Proposal*, is less exciting than the poetry; but he had lost none of his skill as a controversialist. Admittedly, when read one after another as they appear in this volume, the prose tracts may become wearisome in their repetition of Swift's unchanging sentiments about the restriction of Irish trade by England's

Navigation Acts, the discouragement of agriculture, the decline of Irish manufacture, the oppression of landlords, and the drain of the country's wealth through absenteeism. The panaceas that he had been urging on the Irish for years had never been tried, and so he could only go on reiterating his remedies, social, economic, and political, though they had had, he admitted, 'as little effect as what I say at present is likely to produce'. It is not enough, however, to concede his doggedness. In fact these writings were spread over several years and his arguments given differing form as fresh occasions for his counsel arose. Nor were they all published at the time; six of those written in 1729 never got into print, as far as we know, during Swift's lifetime. Swift himself complained that he could not find a printer ready to risk the expense of printing them. It was probably the more serious risk of prosecution that deterred the printers. Davis's explanation is that Swift was too despondent to carry his purpose through into print when there was so little prospect of achieving any good.

For the student of literature considered as the art of influencing men's minds and moving them to action, these pamphlets are a revelation of Swift's singular skill in addressing different classes of reader and artfully adapting his matter to every circumstance of the particular occasion. There is the dramatic asperity of his portrayal of the bishops' placemen when he comes out as the spokesman of 'The Clergy of this Nation, and all the young Gentlemen in our Universities':

> I could name certain Gentlemen of the *Gown*, whose aukward, spruce, prim, sneering, and smirking Countenances, the very Tone of their Voice, and an ungainly Strut in their Walk, without one single Talent for any one Office, have contrived to get good Preferment by the meer Force of *Flattery* and *Cringing* (p. 196),

where incoherence in syntax only adds force to the denunciation. And there is much else as good, and better; the variety and aptness of his methods are genuine cause for marvel. Only *The Intelligencer* papers fail of their intended effect, by neglecting the lighter touches necessary for a popular periodical, features evident enough elsewhere, as for instance in the grotesque and hilarious farce of the dull dog of a Whig bowled over by a genuine mastiff, supposedly of the same political persuasion (p. 221). Aphorisms and proverbs are used to cap the more popular appeals, and Swift's priesthood is in evidence everywhere, not only in his support of the Church and clergy, or his historically valuable first-hand account of the life and duties of an ordinary English parson of the day, contrasted with his Irish counterpart (pp. 181–2), but in the constant reinforcement of his style with biblical phrase and allusion. When every allowance is made for Swift's personal disgruntlement and for his political rancour against Walpole, the fact remains that he was so deeply moved by the miseries of Ireland because he always took the teachings of Christianity seriously. And that is just as true of *A Modest Proposal*. When seen in its historical setting among these other tracts, its import cannot be mistaken. It is both the consummation of his dexterity as a pamphleteer and the ultimate climax of all his political and moral realism in an unsparing exposure of the callousness of politicians and projectors towards the hungry and oppressed. It converts despondency and defeat into a great statement of compassionate humanity.

The editing of these pieces is as accurate and scholarly as that of all the other volumes of Davis's edition. With good reason *The Present Miserable State of Ireland* is rejected from the canon. The case is less conclusive against *A Narrative of the Several Attempts . . . for a Repeal of the Sacramental Test*, published as numbers iii and iv of *The Correspondent* in 1733 and ascribed to Swift by Nichols in 1779. Swift's statement in his letter to Ford (20 November 1733), that 'Dr. Tisdel writes a weekly Paper called the *Correspondent*, generally very poor and Spiritless', is not in itself sufficient reason for rejecting it, and in its context may be taken as an intimation that Swift at least helped Tisdall and perhaps provided him with parts of the *Narrative*. It is significant that he twice alludes to the *Narrative* in *The Presbyterians Plea of Merit* and on each occasion bases his argument on passages in it. Except where a manuscript survives, Davis follows the now well-established practice of taking as his copy-text Faulkner's Dublin edition of Swift's *Works*, and failing that, Deane Swift's edition of 1765. Where I have been able to check with transcriptions of my own, only a few minor differences of spelling and punctuation appear. It is strange, however, as his will now be the standard text, that Davis's quotations in the Introduction do not themselves agree in all particulars with the corresponding passages in his text. The transcripts from the Rylands manuscripts in Appendix B differ at some points from those published by Ehrenpreis and Clifford,[1] and a check with the page of photographic facsimile reproduced by Davis shows that sometimes it is he who has misread the manuscript. Thus on p. 309 'Irld.' (l. 9) should clearly be 'Holl^{d}'; 'Who would write in Bedlam' (l. 10) should be 'Whoever would write on Bedlam'; and 'Legislator' (l. 13) should be 'Legislatre'. Elsewhere the following misprints should be corrected: 'alternate' for 'alternative' (p. xxi, l. 8); 'convicted' for 'convinced' (p. xxxi, l. 5); 'residence' for 'residing' (p. xxxvi, l. 4); a wrong fount N in the heading (p. 85); 'by' for 'to' (p. 186, l. 7); 'our' for 'out' (p. 198, l. 24); in the Index *Beggars' Opera* (*bis*) for *Beggar's Opera* (p. 353), and the reference to p. x should be listed under Gay's letters, not the *Beggar's Opera*; *Guliver's Travels* for *Gulliver's Travels* (p. 356); *Proposal for Universal Use of Irish Manufactures* for *Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture* (p. 356); 'Trowbridge' for 'Tunbridge' (p. 357); 'villiany' for 'villainy' (p. 357). More seriously, a line of type has dropped out between the second and third lines of text on p. 156.

But these are venial lapses of a kind almost unavoidable in such a detailed piece of editing. Davis's admirable presentation of the Irish tracts should serve to direct attention to these less familiar writings, so much neglected as compared with Swift's more memorable works. They deserve quite as much consideration as his English political pamphlets by the historian, the biographer, and the student of Swift's literary art.

COLIN J. HORNE

[1] 'Swiftiana in Rylands English MS. 659 and Related Documents' in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxxvii (1955), 368–92.

***The Englishman.* A Political Journal by Richard Steele.** Edited by RAE BLANCHARD. Pp. xxii+498. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. 50*s.* net.

It is most satisfactory to have at hand the *Englishman*, not reprinted since Steele's own day, and thanks are due to Professor Blanchard, first among our Steele devotees, for giving us the successor to the *Guardian*, with which the collections of essays have always said good-bye to the creator of Nestor Ironside. There are two series, the first running from 6 October 1713 till 15 February 1714. That volume 'was written with a direct Intention to destroy the Credit, and frustrate the Designs of Wicked Men, at that Time in Power'. In short, it is the voice of the Whigs in opposition at the time of the Tory triumph, an answer to the *Examiner*. The second series, which began on 11 July 1715 and ended on 21 November of that year, is directed to fostering good will towards the new régime. The great majority of the papers in the first volume were written by Steele; almost all in the second are from his hand.

The first volume can be said to have been engendered by Nestor Ironside, who 'transfused' his spirit into an unknown writer, 'and with a Voice of Exhortation said, *Be an* ENGLISHMAN'. But the spirit of the wise commentator on social and moral matters soon evaporates, and is entirely absent from the second volume. In short, we no longer have the Steele whom John Porter praised dithyrambically as the supreme teacher, refiner, and reformer, who had revived the moral laws of England, nor even, except very sparsely, the man who, as Felton put it, rescued criticism from pedantry, dullness, and ill nature. We have, instead, Steele the politician, author of *The Crisis*, of *The Importance of Dunkirk Consider'd*. But here we get him at his best, at his most moderate, reasoning, rather than urgently arguing, on a fairly solid basis of reading and thought. Rather than being a continuation of the *Guardian* it might be said to be that of *Review*, addressed to a more highly educated body of readers than Defoe had in mind. Steele expects them to be able to follow an argument, to read attentively such documents as the articles of impeachment drawn up to indict Bolingbroke, or a report written by Godolphin some years earlier. Yet besides being good-humoured and urbane, in marked contrast to the *Examiner*, he is humorous; he carries the reader into the life and conversation of people who in the ordinary movement of the world have to live together, and take their ease in the same coffee-houses. And the reader is aware all the time that he is listening, not merely to a party politician, but to a man of letters, who may bring in delightful references and quotations from a wide range of unexpected sources, whose motive for action is a liking for human beings rather than a hatred of opponents.

These papers, it is reasonable to suppose, will be of interest chiefly to historians, yet they cannot fail to be attractive to anyone engaged in the craft of writing, in studying how to persuade, how to keep the reader's mind alert, how to appear to digress while in reality winding closer to the point. There is also a great sense of life pervading the collection; it is not only the advertisements that, as Miss Blanchard puts it, 'suggest a reading public, alive and lusty, who were buying and selling, eating and drinking, making themselves healthy and beautiful, losing their possessions, going to the theatre, to auctions, to school reunions, to lectures

and to church . . . [giving] the effect of movement, things going on, politics one, but not the sole, business of life'. Used judiciously, the collection makes agreeable lighter reading even now. Admirably full explanatory notes are provided at the end, together with a selection from the advertising columns, confined in the main to publications, giving a sense of the multitude of contemporary interests.

BONAMY DOBRÉE

Pope's *Dunciad*. A Study of its Meaning. By AUBREY L. WILLIAMS. Pp. x+162. London: Methuen, 1955. 18*s*. net.

Students of Augustan poetry have reason to be grateful to Mr. Williams for his thorough and scholarly examination of *The Dunciad*. It is a work that has been both neglected and misunderstood, and most critics, while recognizing its power, have condemned the subject-matter as personal and ephemeral. Mr. Williams's book is an admirable justification of *The Dunciad* against the strictures of those who claim that it is imperfect as a mock-heroic poem because it lacks a proper action, and those who would deny it any permanent moral value as a satire.

Mr. Williams takes Pope's own notes as his starting-point when he sets out to prove that the action of the poem is the removal of the empire of Dullness from the City to the Court, just as the action of *The Aeneid* is, in Pope's own words, 'the Removal of the Empire of Troy to Latium'. He has found a good many verbal echoes of Dryden's *Aeneid* in the first two books of *The Dunciad* to support his claim, but the most elaborate and interesting part of his argument here is his study of the route followed by the Dunces in their removal from one seat of empire to the other. By a series of convincing details he relates the progress of the Games in Book II to the progress of the Lord Mayor's procession, and shows how this represents a breakdown of literary and moral values in the spread of popular tastes for spectacle and bad poetry from the old precincts within the City boundaries to the world of St. James's which should uphold polite and aristocratic standards in conduct and literature. The whole chapter in which Mr. Williams deals with this background to the first two books of the poem is accurate, original, and of genuine importance to our understanding of the work.

In discussing the moral bias of the satire, Mr. Williams inevitably concentrates most on the material of Book IV. He devotes an interesting chapter to the Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns, in so far as it involved philosophical issues that were immediately relevant to Pope's aim. His description of the struggle between two ways of thought—the one based on wisdom and experience, the other on reason and experiment, is well documented, and, like Miriam Starkman's similar account in *Swift and the Satire on Learning in 'The Tale of a Tub'*, touches on a good many points which English critics, since Sir Walter Raleigh's Essay on *The Battle of the Books*, have tended to neglect. Mr. Williams is the first critic I know who has realized the full importance of this whole dispute to Pope's moral satire, and in doing so he has vitally increased our

understanding of the significance of the Fourth Book of *The Dunciad*. I am only sorry that he has confined himself to the ideas involved, and has nothing to say of the personalities in Pope's own circle who were intimately concerned with them. It would be interesting to consider, for instance, how far Pope was affected in his attitude by his friend Atterbury, who was himself the leading light of the Christ Church Wits in the original attack on Bentley and Wotton, and who was as eager as Swift to encourage Pope's satiric vein.

These two aspects of Mr. Williams's book seem to me the most original and valuable, but he breaks other new ground too. He makes a bold attempt to relate the Scriblerus apparatus to the text in the *Variorum Dunciad*, and to analyse the total effect of this involved medium. But there are pitfalls in such a venture which he does not always avoid. It is interesting to follow the analogy that Mr. Williams makes between the *Variorum* edition and a work like the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, but the comparison only seems to emphasize the private nature of such an elaborate literary joke, which in itself is so typical of the methods of the Scriblerus coterie. Swift, who had used humanist satire as a model for his parody in *The Tale of a Tub*, is the prevailing influence on the *Variorum Dunciad*, and Mr. Williams has not convinced me that Pope had any other intention in providing this complicated apparatus than to extend the ironic literary attack in an ingenious and elaborate manner well calculated to delight his friends and his own involved sense of humour. Mr. Williams's belief that the Scriblerus notes, with their naïve and pompous insistence on the humanity of the Dunces, actually soften our feelings for them, because the author meant us to be aware that his victims were involved in human frailty, does more credit to his sensibility than to Pope's. The Scriblerus comments on Curl's possible disease, in the notes on Book II, 175–6, lose their nasty but powerful ironic effect if we are to take it that Pope himself shared the benevolence of Scriblerus so far as to want to make us aware that every man is 'involved in imperfection'. The principle of Pope's satire was perfection, and it was based on a resolute moral idealism. Satire is seldom compassionate, and outside *The Dunciad*, when his moral intention is more apparent, Pope's attacks are not often softened by a wide imaginative charity of the kind that Mr. Williams hints at here, but rather balanced by passages of straightforward praise of virtue which sometimes suggest an almost sentimental idealism. It seems to me unlikely that Pope would have tried to touch the note of deeper tolerance in his ironic Scriblerus annotations, for it would have been dangerous both to the joke and to the underlying satiric rage. In recognizing Pope's sincerity as a moral satirist, there is always a temptation to interpret everything he wrote in a way which makes it more congenial to our own ideas of humanity; but it is a temptation to be avoided, for in softening the satiric blow we lose much of its poetic impact. 'Self love is a busy prompter', said Johnson, commenting on the poignancy of Dryden's attacks on Shadwell and Settle, but it is the source of one kind of good satire, and I cannot help thinking that it was self-love and not social that prompted the telling ironies of the Scriblerus notes and the individual passages they illustrate.

Mr. Williams has some interesting hints as to the influence of seventeenth-century 'Progress' and 'Session' poems on the form and setting of the Third and

Fourth Books of *The Dunciad*. But I must disagree with him in his rejection of *MacFlecknoe* as an important source for the poem. If he had wanted to find an earlier use of satire against the City and its values, he had only to look back as far as Dryden. For in satirizing the 'True-blue Protestant Poet', Shadwell, Dryden naturally provided him with the appropriate Puritan and Whig background of the City. He made the association primarily for political and religious reasons, but it gave him the chance to attack Shadwell's poems and plays by linking them with the vulgar spectacles and the products of the 'suburbian Muse' which were the taste of the City crowd who shared Shadwell's convictions. Dryden provided Shadwell with a City genealogy, starting with Thomas Heywood, who had been City poet between 1631 and 1639, and culminating in Ogilby, whose business-like successes in translating and printing marked him out as a sort of literary merchant, and who had been put in charge of the ceremonies at the coronation of Charles II. The whole idea of a City progress, similar to that in *The Dunciad*, is involved in the poem, from Shadwell's water excursion to his coronation. The theatrical setting which Mr. Williams points out in *The Dunciad* is again anticipated in *MacFlecknoe* in the description of the nameless theatrical booth where Shadwell is to be crowned, and the farcical trap-door conclusion which was taken from Shadwell's own play *The Virtuoso*.

Similarly, when Mr. Williams suggests on p. 36 that Sir Richard Blackmore was chosen by Pope to illustrate 'poetic folly and bourgeois morality' he might have supported his point by referring to the Prologue to *The Pilgrim* (1700), in which Dryden defended himself satirically against Blackmore's ill-natured and self-righteous attack on the indecencies of his early comedies. All the materials that Pope used are here, and the passage might have helped to elucidate Mr. Williams's cautious note on p. 38:

> The brethren donkeys may hint at Puritan preaching noted for its sonorous qualities. This would suggest again, of course, that Blackmore's voice is merely the metaphorical vehicle for the spread of middle class values westward.

For Pope in *The Dunciad*, II. 252–68 was adapting the satirical attack that Dryden had already made in these lines:

> Our Mountebank has laid a deeper Train;
> His Cant, like *Merry-Andrew*'s Noble Vein,
> Cat-call's the Sects to draw 'em in again.
> At leisure Hours in Epique Song he deals,
> Writes to the rumbling of his Coaches Wheels;
>
> . . . . . .
>
> We know not by what Name we should Arraign him,
> For no one Category can contain him;
> A Pedant, canting Preacher, and a Quack,
> Are load enough to break one Asses Back. . . .
>
> (Prologue to *The Pilgrim*, 38–42, 46–49)

Apart from this neglect of Dryden, however, there is hardly any fault to be found with Mr. Williams's study of the literary and historical background of

The Dunciad. The book raises many interesting topics with regard to the subject-matter and aims of Pope's satire, and it is written not only with scholarly accuracy but with sympathy and a sensitive appreciation of his genius.

RACHEL TRICKETT

William Hogarth. *The Analysis of Beauty*. With the Rejected Passages from the Manuscript Drafts and Autobiographical Notes. Edited with an Introduction by JOSEPH BURKE. Pp. lxii+244. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. 42*s*. net.

The Analysis of Beauty has suffered in recent times from misrepresentation and neglect. If this was owing to its inaccessibility, the excuse is now removed by the publication of an exceedingly handsome edition, with twelve plates, at what must be regarded today as a moderate price. If, on the other hand, neglect was owing to the obtuseness or inattention of the reader (to both of which the present reviewer must plead guilty), the editor has done all that a man can do by his learned and persuasive introduction to obliterate the common notion that the *Analysis* shows merely a narrow preoccupation with the serpentine line.

The text of this edition is based upon the first edition of 1753, 'the only text which Hogarth himself revised', but the copy-text has been cleaned of errors which were overlooked in proof-reading, and of 'certain anomalies of punctuation'. Three manuscript drafts of the *Analysis* are extant, and twenty-eight pages of passages ultimately rejected are now printed from them for the first time; but the printer's copy does not survive. It must have differed substantially from the latest draft, which is itself a copy of the second draft submitted by Hogarth to his friends for revision. In its absence we cannot tell precisely how much assistance Hogarth received from his collaborators; but though the early drafts show him at times 'gabbling monstrously', they also show that he knew his own meaning and that he eventually succeeded in endowing his purposes with words. The excerpts from the drafts do not make easy reading, but there is some compensation in watching the development and elucidation of an idea. From the surviving evidence Professor Burke presents a persuasive case on the way in which Hogarth was helped: it looks as if he talked freely with his friends about his ideas, and they supplied him with supporting instances from their reading, besides helping to correct and revise his manuscript. But the ideas were his in the first instance. One is reminded of Wordsworth's remark in the 1800 preface to *Lyrical Ballads*: 'Aristotle, I have been told, has said, that Poetry is the most philosophic of all writing: it is so.' With just such a *floreant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt* does Hogarth commend Michelangelo's observation on the serpentine line—the passage comes from the autobiographical fragments printed in Mr. Burke's appendix:

> I was extremely glad to find the line which I had conceiv'd to be part of what might be form'd into a system with regard to forms so well kept in countenance by Michael angelos precept which was first pointed out to me in Lamozzo by D^{r} Kenede. . . . To give it farther credit I have since from such authors as I could meet with in order to give farther credit to such observations as are here after laid down.

In fact his theories were built up from his own observations; and this empirical character of his thinking is maintained in the treatise by a constant appeal to the reader's experience of everyday life, and is further refreshed by references to the two accompanying plates. There his principles are illustrated by a whole medley of sketches, of statues, portraits, flowers, table-legs, corsets, candlesticks, fire-grates, and human figures in a country dance. Mr. Burke rightly places the *Analysis* in 'the great traditions of English empirical philosophy'; and, as he maintains, it is the only aesthetic treatise of the time to stand there. No wonder Hogarth found himself opposed to much of the best contemporary theory. For him the appeal to Nature was more fruitful and authoritative than the appeal to Nature Methodized, to an ideal nature: neither ancient sculptors nor modern 'have ever yet come up to the utmost beauty of Nature. Who but a bigot, even to the antiques, will say that he has seen faces and necks, hands and arms in living women, that even the Grecian Venus doth but coarsely imitate.'

This is perhaps the most important aspect of the *Analysis* in the history of criticism; but it is also of great interest for the light it throws on Hogarth's work as a painter. On this, on Hogarth's literary work before 1753, on the contemporary reception of the *Analysis*, including its effect upon Burke's *Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, and Reynolds's reaction to it, Mr. Burke has much to say. He has put us all in his debt. JOHN BUTT

Tristram Shandy's World. Sterne's Philosophical Rhetoric. By JOHN TRAUGOTT. Pp. xvi + 166. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. 22*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mr. Traugott's book makes a very valuable contribution to our understanding of Sterne's purposes and methods in *Tristram Shandy*, and will be important for all serious students of eighteenth-century techniques of wit. Unfortunately, many readers will be fatally deterred by the obscurity of the presentation.

In the first part he deals with Sterne's exploitation of Locke's ideas, a topic already treated by Wilbur L. Cross, Kenneth MacLean and others; but Mr. Traugott's treatment of it is the most discerning which has yet appeared. He corrects Cross's rather loose statement that *Tristram Shandy* 'is organised throughout on Locke's doctrine of the Association of Ideas',[1] stressing (not, of course, for the first time) that Locke's theory was intended to explain freakish mental processes only, Sterne's digressions being examples of the conscious artistic use of the digression in literature from the Renaissance onwards. Sterne's calculated development of associations in the organization of the book does not illustrate Locke's theory: but the theory did amuse him and he showed it in operation in Uncle Toby's helpless confusions of thought over 'bridge', 'train', 'siege', &c., and in Mrs. Shandy's question about the winding of the clock. The fact that 'association of ideas' became a different matter for Locke's successors, such as Hume, who applied it to normal thinking, has caused misunderstanding

[1] 'Laurence Sterne in the Twentieth Century', *Yale Review*, N.S. XV (1925), 99–112, esp. 106.

among readers of Sterne, and Mr. Traugott clears this up. He differs from MacLean[1] in his interpretation of the passage (*Tristram Shandy*, 2. viii) which illustrates Locke on duration, and he is probably right. But Mr. Traugott sees a mischievous play with Locke's theories in several passages where neither the theories nor their author are specifically referred to. For example, Mr. Shandy's bed of council (6. xvii–xviii) and the Widow Wadman's abandonment of speech in favour of the language of the eye (8. xxiii–xxv) he uses to illustrate the consequences of failure to communicate by the medium of 'determinate ideas'. One of the themes of the book, in his view, consists in the comic frustration of Locke's theory of communication: 'the characters are so made that, operating on Locke's premises, they completely foil his rational method of communication. And in the consequent isolation of personalities the vitality of situations is maintained by the comic gropings of those personalities for some sort of concourse.' Mr. Traugott is especially convincing in his analysis of the passage where Locke and the *medius terminus* are introduced into a scene of more than usual confusion between the brothers Shandy (3. xl–xli).

The view that Sterne's novel exhibits a comic clash between life and learned theory has been put forward before. Mr. Traugott develops it further by emphasizing Locke's contribution to the pattern, but at the expense of other materials of erudition.

In the second part, which is the more important, he is concerned with the rhetorical structure of *Tristram Shandy*. Here Mr. Traugott's argument cannot be stated briefly without a damaging simplification. While his formulation sometimes seems perversely difficult and eccentric, a fair-minded reader will recognize that this is partly because he is unwilling in his analysis to miss anything of the almost limitless wealth and complexity of Sterne's art. He demonstrates with remarkable skill how the whole conduct of the book is under the control of Tristram himself as 'facetious rhetor', every incident in which characters appear being dependent on the rhetorical purpose of the larger context. Not that this involves any belittling of 'life': on the contrary, there is a heightening of life by the use of real incidents as rhetorical 'proofs', and a comic play with the proofs as technical forms capable of coming to life. Thus in the chestnut episode (4. xxvi–xxx) on which Mr. Traugott is brilliantly illuminating, Phutatorius involuntarily achieves the figure of *aposiopesis*, and then attributes his distress to Yorick's attempt to make a rhetorical point against him. Dr. Slop, in his argument with Uncle Toby (3. xiv–xv), tries to make a rhetorical point by uttering the word 'forceps' as he brings the instrument from his bag, and a whole chapter is devoted to the ancient oratorical device of producing a significant object at the right moment from the speaker's mantle; but Dr. Slop fumbles it and the argument fails. Several other examples of this kind are analysed. Mr. Traugott is excellent in his discussion of the rhetorical artificiality of Sterne's passages of sentiment: 'Tears, rhetorical tears', is his formula for those mixed effects where the expression of feeling, by becoming a performance, is ironically distanced and controlled. There is an interesting chapter on the link between Sterne's arts in *Tristram Shandy* and his technique as a preacher.

[1] *John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (New Haven, 1936), p. 87.

It is a pity that Mr. Traugott should insist that Sterne is a rhetorician and not a novelist; that the action of the book develops simply, 'as an argumentative device of the opinionative Tristram', to quote a characteristic phrase. Why should he not accept Sterne's technique, which he so ably analyses, as a rather special kind of narrative art? Sterne, like other autobiographical novelists, has a history to relate, but it is his peculiarity that the history is cast in the form of an explanation—an explanation rhetorically dramatized.

Critics of *Tristram Shandy* may be divided into those who study its antecedents, finding the secret of its form in its affinities with older traditions of wit, and those who emphasize Sterne's links with the later masters of the novel, especially those of the present century. Both approaches are valid, but what Mr. Traugott's book demonstrates very forcibly is that, without a study of origins, Sterne's wit and therefore its affinity or lack of it with modern narrative art will not be understood. D. W. JEFFERSON

The Letters of Edward Gibbon. Edited by J. E. NORTON. Vol. I, 1750–1773, pp. xxxii + 408; Vol. II, 1774–1784, pp. xvi + 424; Vol. III, 1784–1794, pp. xvi + 464. London: Cassell, 1956. £8. 8*s*. net.

It is well known that the text of Gibbon's letters which appeared in the *Miscellaneous Works* (1796 and 1815) bore some marks of the free and arbitrary editorial methods in vogue then. Some hard judgements have been passed before now on the editor, Lord Sheffield. More generously Miss Norton stresses our obligation to Sheffield not only for having edited the letters at all but also for having most carefully preserved the manuscripts for the benefit of posterity. There was less excuse for the slipshod edition of R. E. Protheroe (Lord Ernle) which covered much the same ground, with many additions, when Gibbon's papers became available about a hundred years later. Any careful reader of these editions cannot go far without suspecting the readings and the dating in many of the letters. It was therefore a major task in itself to revise them by the aid of the autographs. This Miss Norton has done with scrupulous care and conspicuous success. In addition she has included all letters known from other sources either published or in manuscript, and after inquiries ranging over the whole world has added a number of hitherto unknown letters. Many of them are of value in shedding fresh light on Gibbon's activities, often a kindly light. There was, for instance, his strenuous intervention with the Secretary of State at War on behalf of Thomas Howell, a young protégé of William Hayley (Nos. 514 and others). On the side of learning there is the recovery from Zürich of the Latin letters to Professor Breitinger written when Gibbon was nineteen. These can now be fitted in with the Professor's replies already known to us in *Misc. Works*. These writings are rather essays than letters. They afford, however, a striking testimony to the unrelenting thoroughness of the young man's studies. Again, a long dissertation in the form of a letter (No. 196) has been exhumed from Bishop Hurd's Works. It is concerned with the historical value of *The Book of Daniel*, and, dated in 1772, it is an early and accomplished example of Gibbon's irony.

With many of her discoveries Miss Norton has had to rely on printed texts or transcripts; but at all times she has been at pains to establish, as far as possible, what Gibbon wrote; she provides details of the sources, notes on the dates and, where necessary, brief and apposite commentaries. In this way nearly nine hundred letters are presented, and although others no doubt will turn up occasionally it is unlikely that any great accession to this corpus will now appear.

The total of letters is no bad record for a man who professed his indolence in this activity. In fact he was constantly sending off short notes to his intimates, and these, like his longer letters, bear the unmistakable impress of a flexible and masterly epistolary manner. The topics are mainly personal. References to his historical work are casual and light in tone. He did not engage in intellectual or learned correspondence. Perhaps in the letters of no other comparable writer, if there is one, is there revealed so complete a divorce between the scholar and the social man. The latter appears here in the full complexity of his pleasures, his friendships, and his financial cares. Guided by the very full analytical indexes the reader can reconstruct one of the most detailed records of an eighteenth-century gentleman's life, and the value of these volumes will extend beyond the specific interest in the historian.

In a work of such unflagging accuracy it is difficult to find matter for correction or suggestion. In letter No. 48 possibly 'Aeconomy' is due to a confusion in transcription between a round 'A' such as Gibbon often used and 'O'. He knew the derivation of the word well enough. Letter No. 45a, from Mlle Curchod, ends with the following English phrase: 'A thinking soul is punishment enough, and every thought draws blood'; it is believed that she added these words after the letter had been returned to her. The editor raises the questions 'why they were written in English, and whether they are certainly in the writer's hand'.[1] The words seem to be metrical and are possibly a quotation from a contemporary English play. Perhaps someone can identify the quotation.

D. M. Low

P. B. Shelley. By Elio Chinol. Pp. 390. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1955. L. 2,200.

Signor Chinol brought out a study of Coleridge in 1953 (*Il Pensiero di S. T. Coleridge*), and has now extended his inquiry into the leading ideas and forms of thought of the Romantics in the present book on Shelley. He describes this work as 'uno studio del pensiero e della poesia di Shelley', and sometimes one feels that the 'thought' has been emphasized at the expense of the 'poetry', but it is on the whole a well-argued and well-illustrated defence of the poet, unusually reasonable in its attitudes, and critical in a way that is refreshing in this country, in that the criticism bases itself less on such verbal confusions as have been attacked by writers like F. R. Leavis than on the broad rise and fall of the poem's whole pulse and inspiration, which Signor Chinol tries always to link with Shelley's beliefs and the kinds of impetus he was able to derive from them. The most serious short-

[1] The letter is known only from the printed text in Haussonville's *Le Salon de Mme Necker* (Paris, 1882), i. 62.

coming is the absence of interest in Shelley's imagery. Even if the imagery may seem to have been overworked, and its investigation to lead in any case to general disagreement and rancour, it can hardly be avoided in any full criticism of the poet. Signor Chinol's remarks on *Prometheus Unbound*, for example, although they are just, leave too many questions in the reader's mind, since nothing is said about the extraordinary imagery of Act IV and what it may signify; no mention is made of Shelley's scientific leanings (either here or in other poems like *The Witch of Atlas*) as these have been conjecturally expounded by Carl Grabo and other critics; the judgement is too general, too abstract, to be entirely convincing as it stands. Similarly, the powerful subconscious drive of the imagery in *Alastor* is (with the poem itself) underestimated.

The method of the book is a chronological examination of Shelley's main works, in prose and verse, within a lightly sketched biography. Signor Chinol makes good use of the material available (to 1950), including especially the correspondence of the Shelley circle, and he gives a very careful delineation of the eventual Shelleyan forms of Platonism and Godwinism. His main argument is that both the strength and the weakness in Shelley's work come from the continued coexistence in his mind of two idealisms—the largely rationalistic urge to create the conditions of a real earthly paradise, and the more romantic dissatisfied urge turning away from terrestrial hopes towards the 'white radiance of Eternity' and the 'intense inane'—which often clash, politically in *Hellas*, erotically in *Epipsychidion*, but which keep up between them the distinctively taut and high Shelleyan tension. In *The Triumph of Life*, Signor Chinol thinks, Shelley was making a final move away from the earthbound idealism: its title means in fact the 'trionfo dell' eternità' in this 'duplice tendenza del suo spirito'.

A very fair estimate is given of the major works. The non-angelic Shelley, whether more realistic, more conversational, or more satirical, does not seem to appeal to the author, and he is a little unfair to poems like *The Mask of Anarchy*, *Peter Bell the Third*, *Letter to Maria Gisborne*, and *Swellfoot the Tyrant*. It is certainly not true to say that *The Mask of Anarchy*, for instance, 'non ha più che un valore documentario'. He gives a very convincing account of the place Dante takes in influencing the late works like *The Triumph of Life*. It is interesting to have a modern Italian critic like Signor Chinol confirm that Shelley's understanding and absorption of Dante, especially of the *Inferno*, seem to have been both deep and valuable.

Some of the author's own verse translations into Italian of the shorter lyrics are included. The English quotations are disfigured by about two dozen mistakes, which should certainly be corrected if the book goes into a third edition (the original edition was in 1951).

This book is to be recommended, although it is not in a strict sense a work of original or important research, for its judicious and pleasingly lucid review of Shelley's ideas and beliefs, and of how these have been treated by modern critics.

EDWIN MORGAN

Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity. 1811–1846. By GORDON N. RAY. Pp. xiv+538. London: Cumberlege, 1955. 35*s.* net.

Thackeray's well-known aversion to having his Life written would surely have been conquered by this biography, could he have foreseen it. Professor Ray, with his unrivalled knowledge, his devotion, and his firm faith in Thackeray, acts as the latter's trustee in the present age, approved and encouraged by Thackeray's descendants. There comes to mind a pronouncement by Henry James on Trollope, whom he spoke of as possessing the 'natural decorum of the English spirit'. It is a virtue that this American scholar illustrates for the benefit of our own biographers. The dead have no civic rights; there is no Press Council to protect them from outrage. Mr. Ray, while holding back none of the truth, even when it is ugly, has achieved exactly the right tone in his dealings with Thackeray. The novelist himself could have read these pages without wincing; the statement is fair, moderate, and civilized.

Thackeray, man and artist, as Mr. Ray perfectly understands, is, in the eyes of many, equivocal, if not unsatisfactory. The introduction tells of his reputation in the last hundred years. Partly on account of his own reticences and evasions, more perhaps through the strict loyalty to his wish of Lady Ritchie and Leslie Stephen, Thackeray's character long showed in a doubtful light. The publication of his letters by Mr. Ray made justice to him possible; and now that his life has been treated in depth, as only Mr. Ray among students of Thackeray could do it, he is found to be an interesting figure, even—for his resilience in the face of disaster—an impressive one.

Mr. Ray contends that Thackeray served the English middle classes by redefining for them the ideal of a gentleman. Born into Anglo-Indian society (in the nineteenth-century sense), he was well placed to criticize the world of fashion and power to which his own people had no entry. The Anglo-Indians were cold-shouldered into something like radicalism: Mrs. Carmichael-Smyth, indeed, even admired the Chartist O'Connor. Thackeray grew up a gentleman outsider; moulded (and in part maimed) by Charterhouse; initiated into vices above his station at Cambridge; then flung into the shiftless world of Bohemia in the eighteen-thirties. At once conservative and radical, gentleman and democrat, he had somehow to find his way in a profession with deplorably low artistic and moral standards. Thackeray's salvation, as is well known, came through *Punch*; it was here, among radicals more savage than himself, that his talent at last prospered. In the long battle with Jerrold he developed his own outlook—an indulgent criticism of the comfortable world, which prevailed in *Punch* and made it the favourite of the middle classes. Thackeray, in his own words, had 'come over to the side of the kind wags . . . rather than the cruel ones'.

His evolution to that point is the theme of the present volume. Every stage of the journey has been set down with precision and has been well analysed. Mr. Ray does not disguise that in certain respects Thackeray's mind closed when he was quite young. At Charterhouse, 'his sympathies were drastically narrowed. For ever afterwards he took it for granted that class differences were part of the nature of things; despite the broad humanity of his later outlook, he never ceased

to ask himself about anyone that he met, is he "a man of kindly nurture", a gentleman by birth and education?' He came to prefer 'conformity in dress, conduct, and manners'. These limitations, beyond doubt, recommended him to the Victorian middle-class public. They do not greatly disturb Mr. Ray.

Here the reader first feels an uneasiness that is certainly not dispelled by the last chapter (on *Vanity Fair*). Mr. Ray tells us: '. . . my study of his work in its historical setting has given me a renewed conviction of the greatness of its creator.' To place Thackeray in his historical setting is naturally to see him with different eyes; it is fair to do so, indeed necessary. But we must guard against an evident pitfall of Victorian scholarship. Mr. Ray uses a revealing phrase when he talks of accepting Thackeray 'in something like his own relaxed and tolerant spirit'. The age of Thackeray does not compel the same kind of critical vigilance as, for example, the age of Johnson does: the 'relaxed and tolerant spirit' of Thackeray himself, if too willingly shared, can bring us to accept burlesque as subtle wit, or to place *The Book of Snobs* on a level with *Culture and Anarchy*. Charlotte Brontë, indeed, called Thackeray 'a Titan of mind', and it is perhaps noble to err with Charlotte Brontë. But Thackeray's modest view of himself seems nearer the mark.

For Mr. Ray *Vanity Fair* is a 'revolutionary' book, denoting 'the classic moment of English realism'; it is 'one of those inexhaustible masterpieces which repay almost endless study', and 'one of the half-dozen great novels of the world'. Thackeray's merits in *Vanity Fair* are indisputable—his meticulous rendering of the surface of life; his sense of a particular period; his excellent notation of the language used in the different levels of society; his watchful regard for 'the design of individual lives', as they are affected by the passing of time; his probing of mixed motives, and his hatred of hypocrisy. Even so, does *Vanity Fair* stand comparison with the St. Petersburg scenes in *War and Peace*, which might not have been written without *Vanity Fair*, but surely go far beyond it in vision and feeling? The point has to be made, because frequently Mr. Ray's critical judgements seem to lack the authority and balance with which he discusses Thackeray as a man. It may be that flaws of this kind are inherent in the method of much modern (particularly American) scholarship. Total knowledge of any one author is to be acquired only at a price. A very few authors carry a full civilization with them. Thackeray is not one of these, and sometimes we miss in him what Arnold called 'the lucidity of a large and centrally placed intelligence'. HENRY GIFFORD

Whitman's Manuscripts; Leaves of Grass (1860). Edited by FREDSON BOWERS. Pp. lxxiv+264. Chicago: University Press, 1955; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. $12.50; 94s. net.

Whitman published nine editions of *Leaves of Grass* between 1855 and 1892. Of these, no less than seven contain substantial revisions and additions. The 1860 edition is of outstanding importance for it is the first to include *Calamus*, Whitman's most complex and introspective cycle of poems, some of which were not republished during his lifetime. The manuscript poems which Professor Bowers prints opposite the versions published in 1860 are therefore a valuable guide to Whitman's mind and art at a crucial period in his development.

Perhaps the most interesting deduction to be made from Whitman's revision of his manuscripts is that the moods of uncertainty expressed by some of the *Calamus* poems are offset by the increasing richness of his political and continental preoccupations on the eve of the Civil War. His Northern sympathies are emphasized by the phrase 'indissoluble compacts' added to the second section of *Proto-Leaf* in 1860, by the phrase 'inalienable rights' added to the tenth section of *Chants Democratic*, and still more by his amplification of the line in *So Long!*

> I announce the continued union of the States,

to

> I announce that the identity of These States is a single identity only,
> I announce the Union more and more compact.

Whitman's ecstatic delight in the American continent is attested by the chants of different regions 'away down to Mexico, and up north to Oregon' which he added to *Proto-Leaf* in 1860. After his enthusiastic reception of the first *Leaves of Grass*, Emerson complained that he had expected Whitman 'to make the songs of the nation, but he seems content to make the inventories'. Whitman's intense interest in the statistics as well as the chants of the nation is thoroughly illustrated by his revision of the fourth section of *Chants Democratic*, where he altered the lines,

> The area the Eightieth year of These States, the three millions of square miles,
> The eighteen thousand miles of sea-coast and bay-coast on the main—The twenty-six thousand miles of river passage,

in order to bring the figures up to date:

> The area the Eighty-third year of These States—the three and a half millions of square miles,
> The eighteen thousand miles of sea-coast and bay-coast on the main—the thirty thousand miles of river navigation.

Whatever Emerson may have thought of lines like these, there can be no doubt that other revisions by Whitman in this collection show his approximating more and more closely to the ideal American poet sketched by Emerson in his essay *The Poet*. Especially is this true of Whitman's untrammelled style, his rapt westward gaze, and his deepening awareness of the moving frontier as the creator of American civilization: 'Always the West, with many strong native persons—the increasing density there—the habitans, friendly, threatening, ironical, scorning invaders.' Correspondingly, we find in the thirtieth section of *Calamus* a change from

> For These States tend inland and cheerfully concentrate westward—and I will also,

to

> For These States tend inland and toward the Western Sea—and I will also.

The second version is better because it visualizes the ultimate frontier and Whitman's symbolic quest more concretely than the first one. The fulfilment of this

quest is envisaged in some memorable lines added to the eleventh of the *Chants Democratic*:

> Of what the feuillage of America is the preparation for—and of what all the sights, North, South, East, and West are;
> Of the temporary use of materials for identity's sake.
> Of departing—of the growth of a mightier race than any yet,
> Of myself, soon, perhaps, closing up my songs by these shores,
> Of California—of Oregon—and of me journeying hence to live and sing there.

How strongly Emerson encouraged Whitman to assume this continental consciousness is apparent in some of the fragmentary musings transcribed from the Feinberg Notebook by Mr. Bowers: 'Walt Whitman stands today in the midst of the American people, a promise, a preface, an overture. . . . Will he justify the great prophecy of Emerson?'

Much can also be learnt from Whitman's revisions about the development of his style. In particular, they show that the appearance of organic simplicity and fluency at which he aimed was often attained by considerable effort. They also give warrant to the belief that Whitman's long poetic cycles were not always consciously planned as such to begin with. The manuscripts contain many brief poems, each with a distinctive title. The 1860 edition shows that when Whitman found that these individual poems were falling into a sequence or 'cluster', to use his own more accurate term, he dropped the titles and often added extra introductory and concluding lines in order to strengthen the connexions between the poems. His desire to rhapsodize rather than argue leads him at times to change a strong line to a less forcible one. In the *Chants Democratic*, for instance, the challenge of 'I do not tell facts—those half-truths' is softened to 'I do not tell the usual facts, proved by records and documents' (no. 10). On other occasions, his alterations derive from his love of the tactile image, so that the flabby clause, 'And now while there is upon me the thought of the lives of other globes', is transmuted into 'And now, touched with the lives of other globes' (*Leaves of Grass*, no. 15). His revisions seldom concentrate in this way, however. Whitman's genius, like Shelley's, was for accumulation rather than concentration; he exists most strongly where he abounds. The preparation of a variorum edition of *Leaves of Grass* would seem to be the next major task of Whitman scholarship. Mr. Bowers's excellent work not only leads one to this conclusion but also provides a model for those who would implement it. WILLIAM A. ARMSTRONG

Melville and the Comic Spirit. By EDWARD H. ROSENBERRY. Pp. x+212. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1955. 32*s.* net.

The phrase 'classic inexhaustibility', applied in this book to Melville's analogies, might well summarize the quality of the whole of the man's work, if we are to judge from the amount and variety of critical attention focused upon him of late, in studies ranging from his mysticism, symbolism, tragic vision, ambiguity, and zoology, to his relations with God. Now he is approached from a new and

rewarding angle; it is claimed that the 'tragic titan has reached mythic proportions in modern criticism', and with a welcome change of emphasis the comic element in the titan's genius is brought out in a close analysis of its characteristics, manifestations, and development.

At the outset it is firmly established that, despite his tragic vision and haunted, 'solitary' heroes, Melville had, as he confessed, an 'infirmity of jocularity', that life for him was a divided business, 'half melancholy, half farcical', and that from *Mardi* onwards it was his artistic concern to achieve 'a synthesis of those halves that could contain the whole truth of life'—an aim fulfilled in *Moby Dick*. In turning to the hitherto neglected side of Melville's 'double vision', the author points out the humour inherent in the man's nature, his belief in 'good health and good nature', his 'warm and robust personality'; that he turned instinctively in his early days to comedy, and that it was in comedy that he established his reputation.

The development of his comedy is seen to work out in four Polonius-like categories: (*a*) jocular-hedonic, (*b*) imaginative-critical, (*c*) philosophical-psychological, and (*d*) dramatic-structural. After climbing to the peak of *Moby Dick* it declines, owing to the development of 'special interests' and to the waging of a war of ideas. The basic argument is supported by profuse illustration, covering all the works except *Clarel* and *Billy Budd*, and drawing upon manuscript material, including significant marginal comments found in Melville's reading. Sometimes the original four categories are lost sight of in the wealth of examples, so that one has to grope for them, and sometimes to retrace one's steps, especially in the second half of the book. However, valuable definitions and interpretations can be extracted from the mass of data, despite the need for more pointers. The conclusion would appear to be that Melville's comedy, like all comedy, is a question of values, but that his particular achievement was the juxtaposition and fusion of these values with tragic ones.

The early phase is well defined as 'comedy of hardship', with 'gastronomical keynote', 'a comic spirit which lived on brine and alcohol', displaying a 'jauntiness about sex and religion', a 'Puckish irreverence'. The influence of Rabelais, Shakespeare, and Sterne is clearly traced, not ignoring the faults of tiresomely close derivativeness, and this literary tradition is shown to be toughened by humour of the genuine American folk-lore variety. Anticipations of Mark Twain are noted, and also of James Joyce; and the characteristic comic use of metaphor and pun is shown to reveal a humour which lies in congruities rather than in incongruities.

The most satisfying section is the analysis of *Moby Dick*. Here comedy is defined as expanding into a philosophical view of the universe, interpreted in terms of individual character, especially through the differing 'life-views' of Stubbs, Ahab, and Ishmael. All three have comic vision, but where Stubbs's is unthinking, undeveloped, 'more joy than sorrow', Ahab's is at the other extreme, 'all woe and therefore mad'; while Ishmael stands between the two, detached, aloof, balanced, a soul 'like the eagle', commanding both the heights and the depths. These 'life-views' are put to the test when the characters reach their ultimate destiny, when they have to face the whale—the symbol of

'intangible malignity'. Such comedy, in its combination of 'diabolism and the folklore of hardship', resolves the difficulty of investing whaling men with tragic magnitude, and thus is essential to the tragic theme, the mixture of the two being an 'organic feature of Melville's profoundest exploration of the ambiguity of life'.

The narrower satire of the later work is freshly treated, though the material tends to overwhelm the thesis.

The notes supply not only references, but useful comments; for example, one illuminating paradox concerning Melville and Emerson is tucked away here.

This book has much to offer, its interpretations can be invigorating, direct, and shrewd, but it might with advantage have been either longer or shorter; as it stands its clear basic argument is overcrowded with illustrations that are not always fully integrated or related; these could either have been cut down, or given more generous and precise comment. The whole hovers on the brink of a final clue to Melville, but, as has happened before, he breaks away, eludes the grasp, and retires once more into the mists of infinity. Nevertheless, the enigmatic titan has been revealed for a moment in a brief gleam of unusual light.

MARJORIE THOMPSON

Mark Rutherford. A Biography of William Hale White. By CATHERINE MACDONALD MACLEAN. Pp. x+416. London: Macdonald, 1955. 25s. net.

A biography of William Hale White, who wrote under the pseudonym of Mark Rutherford, is very welcome for three reasons. The merit of his novels justifies some study of the life of the man who produced them. Secondly, he is a writer who, like Proust, drew so directly on his own experience for creative purposes that a biography is helpful in two opposite ways: it can throw light on the origins of characters and events described in the novels; at the same time it can mark the separateness of the author from his works and help to prevent any facile identification of the one with the other. An enigmatic character like Hale White stands in particular need of this service. Thirdly, and perhaps more incidentally, there is the historical interest attaching to the study of a man of intelligence and sensibility whose period of life ran from 1831 to 1913. Both by fortune and temperament Hale White was well placed to note some of the most significant changes of that time.

As a study of Hale White, the man, Dr. Maclean's book is most valuable. It is very well documented and incorporates much original research. Much care has been taken to establish detailed factual accuracy. Thus—to take one example—we learn that gas lighting was installed in the Old Meeting at Bedford in 1838. This means that the passage in *The Autobiography* describing the old man who snuffed the candle chandeliers derives from impressions experienced by Hale White before he was seven. The book abounds in small but interesting points of this kind which cumulatively give great solidity and authenticity to the portrait that Dr. Maclean presents. She has made an exhaustive study of Hale White's journalistic contributions, of unpublished family papers, and of documents relating to any place where he lived or worked, and displays an unfailing

eye for significant detail. For instance, the house at Carshalton, which Hale White built for himself in 1868 and which she describes, is not only interesting for its 'aesthetic' character; it is a delightful foil to the minute accounts of houses and rooms to be found in the novels:

> The mantelpieces were of wood instead of marble. The shutters were plain outside shutters like those on labourers' cottages, fitted so as to exclude any possibility of draughts, even on the windiest nights. Within, the decorations were all of Morris design. The rooms were bare of the litter of ornament which was the fashion of the day. Such ornamental objects as were admitted were simple and noble. In the drawing room the place of honour was held by a plaster-cast of the head of Michael Angelo's Dawn.

Her discovery that in his work at the Admiralty he was the distressed spectator, on paper, of constant experiment in weapons of destruction, each more powerful than the last, is also most interesting. However melancholic by temperament he may have been, he had adequate tangible cause both at work and at home for melancholy, as she shows.

Dr. Maclean writes vividly, although she is perhaps a little diffuse. In this weakness she is unlike her subject, whose economy of utterance her quotations admirably illustrate. Indeed in all respects her quotations are singularly happy; the distinction of Hale White's mind and style is fully shown. Long study of his writings has, however, proved a little 'catching', and there is some unacknowledged quoting or close paraphrasing. Compare, for instance, Hale White in *The Early Life of Mark Rutherford* (p. 78):

> At first, after the abandonment of orthodoxy I naturally thought nothing in the old religion worth retaining, but this temper did not last long.

and Dr. Maclean (p. 117):

> For a time after his abandonment of orthodoxy Hale was inclined to think nothing in the religion in which he had been bred worth retaining. But this frame of mind did not last long in him.

But admittedly with a writer so autobiographical as Hale White, it is not easy to avoid paraphrase.

The one serious limitation of Dr. Maclean's book is that it lacks the salt of criticism. This does not matter very much in her presentation of the life since she allows the facts to speak for themselves. Her slightly over-protective and deferential attitude may have blinded her to some evidence of incompatibility in Hale White's first marriage, but it is an arguable point. The want of critical reference is, however, sadly felt in her treatment of his writings. These are not judged primarily as literature but assessed on their consolatory and religious powers, and Hale White is presented in the character of a seer. 'It seems almost pedantry', writes Dr. Maclean, 'to consider them [the novels] as works of art.'

Since Hale White wrote novels it would seem not unreasonable to attempt an estimate of his quality as a novelist. Moreover, writers like Bunyan and George Herbert have not been exempted from critical analysis on this plea. They have triumphantly survived it. Hale White loses, not gains, from this omission, and so does Dr. Maclean's book.

None the less, it is not likely to be rivalled as a source of biographical information. One gap remains to be filled: Dr. Maclean throws no light on the sources from which Hale White derived the setting of the first half of *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane*. The story opens in 1814 and concerns events which led to the March of the Blanketeers. Hale White might have been a participant from the minuteness of detail and the air of authority with which the scenes are described. What was the basis of this remarkable feat of imaginative reconstruction? Dr. Maclean has told us so much. Perhaps she may yet be able to tell us this.

ROSEMARY BERESFORD

Rudyard Kipling. His Life and Work. By CHARLES CARRINGTON. Pp. xxiv+550. London: Macmillan, 1955. 25*s*. net.

Kipling's position in our literature is still so controversial that the reader's first approach to Mr. Carrington's book is bound to be affected by his own prepossessions. He reads to find an ally or an antagonist. This contentiousness among critics is sufficient evidence of the vitality of Kipling's work. Seldom has a writer so near to the centenary of his birth received so little shelter from history. He refuses to merge into the past. It is not only that his uncompromising opinions concern living issues (cf. p. 388 on South Africa and Rhodesia) but that the impact of his writing remains as strong as ever. At times it is so heavy that the page blurs, as the vibrations of a powerful voice blur articulation, however careful. At least, this seems the best way of accounting for the inaccuracies that beset the criticism of his work.

The temptation to write about Kipling instead of Mr. Carrington must be resisted. He has given us in this long-awaited *Life* a valuable body of authentic fact, together with copious extracts from Kipling's correspondence and some fragments of unpublished verse. He has placed his subject against his historical and social backgrounds in England, India, America, and South Africa, and he has done something, more than may be apparent at first reading, to place him against his literary background. Here, however, much remains to be done. Kipling was both a highly literate and traditional writer and a modernist, catching subject and form from his immediate surroundings. He was both precocious and tenacious; and, for both reasons, the literary incentives offered him by the eighties and nineties are important and remain influential even when submerged. It is here that one would like to see the background extended. Kipling drops a good many hints himself. As late as *The Vortex* he is quoting Stevenson's *The Wrong Box*. But what was the literary incentive to *The Record of Badalia Herodsfoot*, a type of work to which he never returned? Edwin Arnold's *Phra the Phoenician* surely counted for something in '*The Finest Story in the World*'; and this book and *Lepidus the Centurion*, with its humour, its picturesqueness, and complete absence of tushery, lie decomposed in the soil of memory to which the roots of the *Puck* stories run down. Mr. Carrington offers us as the model for these E. Nesbit's *The Phoenix and the Carpet*, and we accept it gladly, as far as

it goes; but here is the voice of Lepidus, waked up from his long sleep at the end of the nineteenth century:

> Where are they, comrade?—Where are the brass-clad legionaries; and the naked British children; and the tall dogs quarrelling over yesterday's refuse; and the white oxen munching their hay by the stone-wheeled carts in the courtyard; and the hucksters bartering Gaulish stuffs for new-plucked boar fangs, or wolf-skins?

This is very like Parnesius. Phra, moreover, watched in one incarnation the draining of the legionaries from Britain and in another fought at Hastings. Mr. Carrington is, I think, the first to point out the anticipation of some of Kipling's mannerisms in Besant's *All in a Garden Fair*, a book to which Kipling expressed indebtedness. How widely were they spread? Now that the ephemeral work of his contemporaries has perished, and the tones of the old boys of Westward Ho! and of the English officers and civilians at Lahore and Allahabad are heard no longer, he stands responsible for much which may have been common form. Common form also contributes in some measure to what has been called the baffling reserve of *Something of Myself*. This book covers much the same ground as the autobiographies of Trollope, Besant, and C. G. Leland (of the *Breitmann Ballads*). What the writer thinks fit to impart are the circumstances of his early life that made him a writer, his emergence on the public scene, and some of the guiding principles in his work. The private life of the man is not confided to the public. It illustrates the tenacity of Kipling that *Something of Myself* keeps this shape, and the change in literary expectations that it is now found so surprising.

Mr. Carrington's book is indispensable. We do not know what he has left out, but he has put in nothing that is not useful and illuminating, and he has presented his material in a lucid and easy style. Again and again he provides facts that substantiate the reader's guesses. Kipling did devote lifelong study to the Elizabethan dramatists, and there was personal experience behind the love-theme in *The Light that Failed* as well as behind the art-theme. He gives us exact dates for some of the tales; *The Gardener* was started on 14 March 1925 after a visit to Rouen Cemetery and finished on 22 March at Lourdes. How long the elements of it had lain in Kipling's mind is another thing. His choice of material often has a critical bearing which he has no room to develop. Such is C. E. Norton's comment on his friend as illustrating the poetic imagination working under difficulties:

> There is little to nourish or quicken the spiritual side of his nature, but he has done a better work for his time than any other man in treating, through the poetic imagination, the material conditions which surround us all.

As a critic Mr. Carrington maintains a sober staunchness. He has mostly avoided protest, but he has not been willing to let a good case go by default. He is best on the earlier work, especially the soldier songs. His insistence that they recorded 'the living folklore of the proletariat' is very valuable, and so is his tracing of the tunes and hymns to which Kipling wrote much of his verse. He is not so satisfactory on the later tales, though he praises some highly, and we owe him thanks for his courage in speaking of the subtleties of Kipling and of Henry

James in one breath. But *Dayspring Mishandled* is again mishandled and the psychological curiosity in *Sea-Constables* is quite missed. These tales, indeed, demand a closeness of attention that has been more readily given them by private readers than by professional critics. Their obscurity yields on repeated reading. The lovers of Kipling seem to be divided into two classes by almost as deep a gulf as the readers of William Morris; and this in itself proves how deep and wide the development of his art was.

The *Life* is a good and sound piece of work that grows upon one with a second reading. Among its other merits, it lays down a groundwork for the scholarly investigation of Kipling that is now overdue. As Mr. Carrington says, 'the student of literature cannot neglect or ignore him'. J. M. S. TOMPKINS

D. H. Lawrence. A Basic Study of his Ideas. By MARY FREEMAN. Pp. viii + 278. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1955. $5.00.

D. H. Lawrence. Selected Literary Criticism. Edited by ANTHONY BEAL. Pp. xii + 436. London: Heinemann, 1956. 25*s.* net.

Numerous books have been written about the life of D. H. Lawrence and many attempts have been made to appraise his achievement as a writer. There have, however, since Aldous Huxley's notable pioneer essay, been few serious studies of his 'thought'. The exposition and evaluation of the 'thought' of any great creative artist is always a very delicate and difficult task, and the solemnities of nineteenth-century Wordsworthians, exquisitely mocked by Matthew Arnold, provide a salutary warning. Mrs. Freeman in her well-written and thoughtful 'basic study' of Lawrence's ideas has been, on the whole, very successful in avoiding most of the pitfalls that bring to grief so many works of this kind. She has to a remarkable degree the qualities that are necessary for a successful approach to this aspect of Lawrence's work. She is clear-headed, sensible, detached, extremely well informed, sympathetic to Lawrence's views, though never uncritical, and highly sensitive to the aesthetic values of his writings.

In her 'Preview' Mrs. Freeman defines Lawrence's 'most pervasive aim' as the attempt 'to link experiences in his writing as they are seldom linked in our thinking and in so doing to reveal an ethos at once individual, social and perhaps universal'. She lists and effectively disposes of 'illusions evoked by the prevailing limited views of Lawrence', the views of him as 'an erratic, contradictory man', as 'an author obsessed by sex', as an artist who 'sinned against art', as a 'primitivist', and as a reactionary with fascist leanings. For her, Lawrence's work is a series of explorations which set him 'apart from the contemporary iconoclasts as well as from conventional society'. In the succeeding chapters she traces Lawrence's 'wide-ranging untrammelled speculations' by means of a series of studies of his writings. *Sons and Lovers* is the starting-point, 'the firm base from which Lawrence moved towards even more complex speculations', but the main line of development is shown as leading from *The White Peacock*, with its vivid but immature and inconclusive presentation of the conflicts of modern life, through *The Trespasser* to *The Rainbow*, of which a notable analysis is given. In

The Rainbow Mrs. Freeman notes certain 'perverse twists', which are 'still tentative and undeveloped'. In *Women in Love*, its immediate successor, Lawrence is described as concerned at once with 'the death of a whole culture' and his own 'need for coming to terms with death'. Here and in other works he is shown as approaching the attitude of the Futurists in trying 'to raise death and pain to an ecstasy'. A very suggestive chapter on 'Lawrence and Futurism' draws attention both to the superficial kinship between Lawrence and the Futurists, and the profound difference between his attitude and theirs, acutely summed up in the following sentence: 'He was not willing to accept a confusion of opposites as a resolution of them'. Lawrence's social and political views are studied and illustrated from his novels and essays and also from the neglected but important play *Touch and Go*, which is linked in a suggestive way with *Women in Love*. The often-repeated legend that Lawrence was a kind of proto-fascist is ably disposed of in a chapter on 'Lawrence and Fascism', where the 'severe critics' who have 'humorlessly implied that Lawrence's occasional high-handedness in personal relations indicated a predilection for social authoritarianism' are justly castigated, and Lawrence's view of death as 'a down-beat in life's creative rhythm' is effectively contrasted with the Nazi view of death as 'an exciting and therefore doubly cherished means to power'. In Lawrence's later works Mrs. Freeman sees a memorable change of direction from the obsession with the 'singing death' and the setting in of a 'counter current towards life'. This 'counter current' is found in such works as *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, where Mrs. Freeman rightly notes 'a new simplicity and freshness', and especially in the Lady Chatterley books. This part of the book might have been profitably expanded and more stress might have been laid on the religious vision of the Last Poems. Mrs. Freeman certainly deserves the thanks of all students of Lawrence for the delicate understanding and sympathy with which she has told the story of one of the most significant spiritual explorations of our times. Her book is a notable contribution to the understanding of the true meaning of Lawrence's 'prophecy'. A couple of trifling errors should be corrected in later editions. The name of the family portrayed by Galsworthy is 'Forsyte', not 'Forsythe', and the husband of Lady Chatterley was not Lord Chatterley. The Bibliographical Guide provided at the end of the volume is full, valuable, and authoritative.

In connexion with Mrs. Freeman's work it is profitable to consider the latest book by Signor Leone Vivante, who is well known both in Italy and in the English-speaking countries as a philosopher and a writer on aesthetics.[1] He expounds his 'philosophy of potentiality' and concludes with an extremely interesting and suggestive study, consisting of two lectures given at the University of Nottingham, of D. H. Lawrence's 'insight into the concept of potentiality'. In a notable passage Vivante draws attention to Lawrence's 'profound feeling of a creative, underived, intrinsically characterized essence', which is 'one with the feeling of a fundamental identity in the deeper nature of man' and he sees Lawrence's writings pervaded with 'that which is fundamental and characteristic in democracy'—'perhaps in spite of Lawrence himself'.

[1] *A Philosophy of Potentiality* (London, 1955).

Lawrence's literary criticism is an important part of his work, but his criticisms are scattered through a large number of publications and many of them are not easily accessible. A great part of his critical writing is contained in that invaluable compendium *Phoenix*, but this has long been out of print and is now a rare book. The appearance of a fairly stout volume containing a selection from his critical writings is therefore to be welcomed. Unfortunately this selection is not very satisfactory. Readers will be astonished to find that it does not contain a single extract from *A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*, which may well be considered Lawrence's most notable critical pronouncement, while in the section entitled 'Why the Novel matters' they will look in vain for the famous description of the function of the novel in the ninth chapter of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and in the section headed 'Verse' for the memorable Preface to the *Collected Poems*. Moreover, short, casual, and by no means always very well-chosen extracts from the letters are often mixed up with much more serious and important utterances. Surely there can be no excuse for an arrangement which inserts between the prefaces to *The Grand Inquisitor* and Shestov's *All Things are Possible* two snippets from letters, one of which is obviously merely a joke at the expense of a humourless worshipper of Tchekhov. Nevertheless, in spite of the many shortcomings of this selection, one must be grateful to Mr. Anthony Beal for providing within a single volume such notable things as *Hymns in a Man's Life*, the essay on Galsworthy, large parts of the *Study of Thomas Hardy* and the *Studies in Classic American Literature* (most regrettably omitting the highly significant essay on Franklin), and the *Introduction to the New Poems*. Mr. Beal's introduction is commendably short and business-like. In it he expresses the hope that 'everything of importance has been included here'. Unfortunately this aspiration has not been fulfilled, but at any rate the 'common reader' now, at last, has access to some representative work of one of the greatest literary critics of the present century.

V. DE S. PINTO

Essays by Divers Hands, being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. New Series, Vol. XXVII. Edited by SIR GEORGE ROSTREVOR HAMILTON. Pp. xii+155. London: Cumberlege, 1955. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

This latest volume of transactions comprises nine excellent papers besides a graceful introduction by the editor. In the first, a glowing appreciation of the late Sir Edward Marsh's translation of *Dominique* by Eugène Fromentin, Dr. Monk Gibbon has much to say about the art of translation in general, an art little regarded in modern Britain until recently, so that if, as the writer suggests, there is a corner of Hell paved with bad translations, it may be taken for granted that a fair proportion of the paviours are British. Yet a translation need not be 'bad' to be unsatisfactory. Dr. Gibbon, for instance, describes an earlier English version of *Dominique* as 'cultured, sensitive, conscientious' and yet without 'vitality' because its author is without style; and he illustrates the point arrestingly by quoting the opening sentence of *Dominique* with its two English versions.

Sir Ifor Evans, in 'Towards a definition of humanism' quotes a striking passage from Yeats in which he complains that 'newspapers, all kinds of second-rate

books, the preoccupation of men with all kinds of practical changes have driven living imagination out of the world', and compares the lot of modern writers with that of Boccaccio and Cervantes—he might well have added Shakespeare—who

> had not to deal with the world in such great masses that it could only be represented to their minds by figures and by abstract generalizations. Everything that their mind ran on came to them vivid with the colour of the senses and when they wrote it was out of their own rich experience and they found their symbols of expression in things that they had known all their life long.

The colours in Shakespeare were even too bright for Dryden who found him 'pestered with figurative expression'. Most writing today is pestered with dead expressions; but this, though serious and depressing enough, is not the heart of the matter. The very existence of poetry and art, Sir Ifor points out, is at stake and this for a number of distinct if related causes. The most immediately destructive of them is perhaps the prevalence of the Freudian psychology which dismisses art and poetry as 'substitute gratification', an 'illusion in contrast to reality'. One result is the cult of ugliness which is the 'protest of the artist against the nature of human existence itself and of the conditions under which it has to be lived'; and another the flight from a hostile world into the private recesses of the poet's unconscious mind. Yet what Keats called 'the holiness of the heart's affections', Sir Ifor notes, has been the central theme of English poetry for 600 years, pre-eminently so with Shakespeare, whom Keats again called the 'mighty Poet of the human heart', and it is the assertion of this theme, the revival of this tradition, for which he pleads, and which is 'humanism' as he redefines it.

The other seven papers are more limited in range. Miss Kate O'Brien on George Eliot gives us the unusual pleasure of looking at one woman novelist through the eyes of another. She is especially interesting on *Romola*, 'which is apparently unreadable now—by everyone but me'; and she insists that *Romola*, *Middlemarch*, and *Daniel Deronda* are the novels for 'the twentieth century novelist, or moralist'. For it is George Eliot the 'moralizing fabulist' that chiefly interests her: 'the right and wrong of each heart—its *own* right and wrong—was her quarry'. Her paper, it will be seen, makes a fitting sequel to that of Sir Ifor Evans.

'Margaret Fuller—American critic', upon whom Mr. Willard Connely enlightens us, was nine years older than George Eliot, and though she spent a few months in England during 1846 and dined with G. H. Lewes at Carlyle's house, he and Mary Ann Evans were then unknown to each other, and the two women, it seems, never met.

Lecturing on 'The young Rudyard Kipling', the Earl of Birkenhead made an important contribution to our knowledge of both literary and educational history. For facts about the upbringing of a great creative artist are relevant to both; but the astonishing and shocking story of Anglo-Indian parents consigning Rudyard aged 5¼ and his sister aged 3 years to the care of an unknown couple living at Southsea in a house called Lorne Lodge, which inevitably became 'Forlorn Lodge' or 'The House of Desolation', where they were regularly beaten by the

wife, 'a respected churchgoer' and rigid evangelical, or tortured on the sly by her son, six years their senior, a sadistic young fiend 'as religious as his mother', belongs, like the much milder *Father and Son* by Edmund Gosse, to the history of late-nineteenth-century English education. And I find the following passage from Lord Birkenhead's paper particularly interesting:

> It is vital to an understanding of Kipling not to over-estimate the effect of this ordeal upon his emotional life. To fasten on this period, as Edmund Wilson has done, in his book *The Wound and the Bow*—to infer from Kipling's experiences at Southsea that his character was warped *in limine*, that as a result it was for ever shot through with prejudice and hatreds—is merely to construct a train of reasoning upon a false premise. Indeed it is almost laughable to see Kipling's character represented as such a tender hot-house plant, sensitive and vulnerable as a tuberose. In fact he possessed such tough powers of recuperation that he emerged from Lorne Lodge unscathed by anything worse than evil and enduring memories. He had then, as afterwards, an endless reserve of vitality on which to draw.

It was phthisis, not a review, that killed John Keats, and one may suspect that emotional toughness is more often than not found with literary genius.

Of the sixth paper, 'Nature and Grace in *Macbeth*' by Mr. Robert Speaight, I note that it is a chapter of his interesting book on *Nature in Shakespeare* published since he lectured to the Society. In the seventh, entitled 'The Prince Regent and the Poets', Miss Dorothy Mary Stuart makes a brilliant addition to her Regency studies and one that should be read by all who rely upon the poets or Thackeray for their conception of the last of the Four Georges. Nearly all the poets of that age lampooned or satirized him. He was no doubt an absurd-looking man and a rather absurd personality, as Miss Stuart amusingly brings out. But, as she also insists, he had his good points. He was the only member of the Hanoverian dynasty with a true, if limited, appreciation of literature, an appreciation attested by his foundation of the Royal Society of Literature and by his genuine admiration for the works of Walter Scott. And Scott in his turn showed his superiority to other men of letters by his appreciation of the Prince.

I must admit to finding the eighth paper, by Mr. Hugh Ross Williamson, difficult to understand. His thesis, he tells us, is that 'history, the historical novel, and the historical play represent grades of increasing difficulty and importance'. But since he expressly excludes the novels of Walter Scott as 'costume romances' from the category of historical novels proper and mentions no others, and since the only historical play he discusses is one of his own, though he quotes with approval Froude's dictum that 'the most perfect English history that exists is to be found in the historical plays of Shakespeare', the thesis can hardly be considered proved.

The last contributor, Major Earl Wavell, writes on 'Shakespeare and Soldiering'. No one who ever conversed with that delightful and noble spirit can cease to mourn for him. And when the wireless on Christmas Day 1953 brought the news of his death in battle with the Mau-Mau, thousands of men younger than himself, who had known him in the field or had learnt to love poetry from him when, having lost a hand in Burma, he took to Army Education, felt that they had lost an older brother. Both he and his great father were enthusiastic Shakespear-

ians. For Shakespeare, as a recent writer on Nelson, another Shakespearian, reminds us, is the supreme poet of men of action, a fact which we bookmen are apt to forget. The essay is modestly described by its author as a 'goulash' of others' scholarship. Yet by bringing together the various references to soldiering in Shakespeare it enables us to view the plays from an unusual angle and leads me at least to think that the dramatist must have been more intimate with the life of soldiers than he is usually given credit for, and does so much more persuasively than Duff Cooper's speculative *Sergeant Shakespeare*. By a curious coincidence Wavell, like Duff Cooper in World War I, found a sergeant of that name in his Company. 'But my Sergeant Shakespeare', he observes, 'had some inherited characteristics for, when I inspected the signing-out book in the guardroom, I discovered that in six entries his name contained four separate spellings'.

J. DOVER WILSON

Speculative Instruments. By I. A. RICHARDS. Pp. xii+216. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955. 21*s*. net.

This is a collection of essays, review articles, addresses, and notes, written at different times and with different audiences or readers in mind. Their unity springs from their common concern with language and meaning, and what Dr. Richards calls 'the politics of the divided mind'. There are three sections in the book: the first, which is the largest and most important, is taken up largely with meaning; the second with educational theory and practice; and the last with the difficulties of reading a text.

Although the writer has spent the greater part of his career in emphasizing the need for clear and distinct ideas in discourse, one is struck by the difficulty of understanding what he is saying in many places in this book. No doubt part of the trouble is because, in Dr. Richards's words, 'The most central theme of these attempts may be the recognition that most ways of studying language use language and must expect to take the consequences.' But this is not the whole explanation. The style itself is needlessly confusing; the following is a sample picked almost at random, but not, I think, unfairly:

> This embarrassment (as I have called it) is really the throne: the charge and task—that of inventing (where inventing is both finding and making) a Supreme Ruler in us which can be justified by its ability to unite under itself, BE in itself, the interests which, without such a Ruler, war with one another in shifting alliances for ever.
>
> A wild dream—as wild as UN (San Francisco model)? What an ill-omened abbreviation *un*, as ill-omened as the name of its early location: 'Lake Success'!

But even more than subject-matter and style Dr. Richards's methodology contributes to the confusion. In the essay entitled 'Emotive Meaning Again', which many readers will find the most interesting in the book, and in which Dr. Richards returns to his old distinction between the referential use of language and the emotive use, he writes: 'The study of metaphor, through metaphor, should become, I have suggested, a central and governing part of the study of

language.' We may agree that the study of metaphor may have this important role, but what does Dr. Richards mean by the phrase 'through metaphor'? The answer he gives is that 'the speculative instrument' we need '. . . would not be a prose account of poetry so much as a poetic account of prose'. Max Black is quoted by Dr. Richards himself as saying: 'R's later doctrines seem to have overcome the doctrinaire rigidity of his earlier nominalistic behaviourism only at the cost of an intrusive and pervasive dissolution of structure. And we seem to be still in as much need as ever of a clarification of the relations between the cognitive and the affective functions of symbolism.' Max Black is right and nothing that Dr. Richards produces in reply seems to me to answer this criticism.

The 'intrusive and pervasive dissolution of structure' is seen throughout the book. Dr. Richards says that 'One man's light is another man's darkness' and he readily admits that his remarks '. . . may seem—even be—wild vagaries; on the other hand they could score inners at least'. But this does no more than excuse the sleight of hand by which he draws inferences in politics and education from conclusions reached in semantics and rhetoric. The image of philosophy as a diplomat or negotiator between the kingdoms of the mind is a recurring one in these essays, and is one that has its uses. In his Foreword Dr. Richards introduces it thus:

> I play with the suggestion that the present role of philosophy should be that of a Diplomacy attempting some mitigation of the conflicts between the opposing studies.

But he then continues:

> Any reader who likes to reverse it also and make it into a plea for a more enterprising and venturesome diplomacy between the nations will not be misreading. Many of the great metaphors are reversibles.

It is not in playing with metaphor in this way that any worth-while relationship will be made between the logic of discursive and the logic of non-discursive language. And that, I take it, is the central problem that concerns Dr. Richards.

We have every reason to be grateful to Dr. Richards for what he has done in the past, but gratitude must not allow us to excuse the faults of this book. And yet there are many good things here. In his essays on Landor and on *Troilus and Cressida* he shows once again the sensitivity in discussing a text that we remember from *Practical Criticism*. There is passionate sincerity, a very real concern for the teaching of English, and a noble conception of what education is for. Dr. Richards has the courage to enlist under the banner of Plato at a time when there are few other volunteers for such service. But he has found in Plato (even when we may disagree with his interpretation in places) a wisdom badly needed in the fields of study he endeavours to relate. R. L. BRETT

Elements of Poetry. By JAMES R. KREUZER. Pp. xiv+256. New York and London: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 20*s.* 6*d.* net.

This book consists mainly of a statement, often fresh and readable, of the textbook poetics which is, or used to be, a part of sixth-form English: chapters

on 'Diction', 'Metrics', 'Rhyme and Other Sound Effects', 'Simile and Metaphor', 'Other Figures of Speech', 'Images', and 'Major Types and Verse Forms'. To these are added a chapter on the 'grammatical' analysis of the New Criticism ('Irony, Paradox, Symbol, Ambiguity') and another which attempts an account of the aesthetic experience ('The Nature of Poetry . . .'). To most of the chapters are appended poems for analysis, with sensible and thought-provoking questions. The whole may well serve as a guide-book for the sixth-former, the first-year undergraduate, or the general reader; the scholar is unlikely to find in it very much with which he is unfamiliar.

Mr. Kreuzer hopes that 'exact definitions' have been achieved (p. ix); this is not always the case, though the defects are trifling enough. It is misleading to write of 'metrical quantity' in a discussion of modern English metre (p. 29); to ignore phonetic precision by pairing such words as *late* and *bat*, *cede* and *get*, *bide* and *it* as illustrations of 'long' and 'short' *a*, *e*, and *i* respectively (pp. 58–59); to base a comparatively extended discussion of simile on a disputed reading in Marvell (p. 77); or to gloss *deface* as 'fell' as if the adjective *fell* were connected with the homonymous verb (p. 103). The first passage from Wordsworth cited on p. 178 does not appear in the second edition of *Lyrical Ballads*; *The Faerie Queene* is ill-defined as an epic (p. 231); and it is curious to find a chapter on 'Major Types' of poetry which contains no account of verse drama.

More seriously misleading than these are certain imprecisions in Mr. Kreuzer's psychology of artistic creation and aesthetic appeal. It is scarcely logical to assert that 'The good poet, as he writes a poem, knows *exactly* what he is doing and why he is doing it. . . . The conception [of the final product] may be *somewhat vague* or it may be startlingly clear' (p. 6; my italics). Milton and Blake claimed supernatural dictation; Wordsworth, that his 'purpose' was not always 'formally conceived' when he began to write. Such claims, and Mr. Kreuzer's own modifications, seem incompatible with his opening statement. No one will expect a treatise on aesthetics to be embodied in a book of this kind; but a sentence like 'poetry fills a need . . . for beauty, for the satisfying of the aesthetic sense in man' (p. 2) raises more questions than the one it purports to answer. There is, indeed, 'a difference . . . between the emotional response to a situation in literature and the response to a situation in real life', but the difference is not adequately explained by the mere invoking of 'what, for lack of a better word, we call the imagination' (pp. 192–3). Mr. Kreuzer is on firmer ground when he shortly moves towards such critics as Johnson and Wordsworth and affirms that 'the sane reader of poetry does not confuse his imagined experience . . . with reality. . . . He is affected by the organization that has been imposed on the raw data of the experience' (pp. 194–5). This vein might have been pursued farther with profit, and undefined generalities like 'imagination' avoided.

In the grammatical analysis of the New Critics, Mr. Kreuzer is often interesting, as in his reading of 'Go, Lovely Rose' (pp. 157–8), but at times over-zealous. His definition of irony as 'a difference . . . between what is said and what is intended' (p. 138) seems too broad: litotes as irony (p. 144) is particularly hard to accept. In his search for ambiguities especially, Mr. Kreuzer proceeds too eagerly. It is improbable that *overwrought* in Keats's *Grecian Urn* will bear the

sense 'overexcited' (p. 9), if only because the singer and the priest do not seem to be in that condition; or that Coleridge's 'The Mariner hath his will' can be read to mean 'that the mariner has gained possession of the will of the wedding guest' (p. 21), since the conventionality of the phrase *to have one's will* (see *O.E.D.*, s.v. *will*, sb.[1], 3) militates against ambiguity. If *cold* in Shakespeare's seventy-third Sonnet can be read as noun or adjective (p. 167), the ambiguity seems merely confusing rather than an enhancement of the meaning. Wordsworth's 'human fears' is unnaturally glossed as 'fears about his beloved as a human being' (p. 201).

Mr. Kreuzer's observations on the gain in emphasis achieved by 'substitute' feet which break a regular metrical pattern are often just; but does the *regularity* of Wordsworth's 'She seem'd a thing that could not feel The touch of earthly years' really 'reinforce the poet's feeling about Lucy: she will never grow old' (p. 202)? Regularity rarely impresses since it is expected; and by Mr. Kreuzer's token many of the dullest couplets of the smooth school of Waller may be seen as masterpieces. Here, as in his search for ironies and ambiguities, and elsewhere in the book, Mr. Kreuzer is asking of his texts more than they can yield.

W. J. B. Owen

Time in Literature. By Hans Meyerhoff. Pp. xiv+160. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. 26*s.* net.

One section of a recent book by a distinguished philosopher is headed: *The Systematic Elusiveness of 'I'*. The nature of personal identity is a puzzle that has long challenged philosophers, psychologists, and literary critics, and their difficulty lies chiefly in the complex time-problem involved. In this closely packed and cogently argued book, Professor Meyerhoff has, however, as his ostensible purpose neither philosophy, nor psychology, nor literary criticism as such. His primary concern is the importance for philosophy of exploring the discrepancies between the scientific theories of time in nature and the psychological evaluation of time in experience. The one is a quantitative, conceptual construct proceeding linearly in a uniform series which is co-ordinated with causality. Experiential time and duration, on the other hand, are perceived qualitatively according to impressions formed privately by value-charged associations. Such a comparison between the ontological and axiological aspects of time leads to a reassessment of the position in the pattern of philosophical and social theory of what Poulet calls *le temps humain*. For illustrations of the way subjective, relative time determines man's interpretation of himself and others as unified and continuous identities, the author has turned to 'the aesthetic reconstruction of the self in literature'.

Personal identity is conceivable only because the self is not a mere passive recorder but a dynamic organizer of the immediate perceptions in relation to memory. Memory, however, being creative and subject to distorting pressures, itself posits an objective, extra-personal time by which to check its course, a *Wahrheit* on which its *Dichtung* may depend. Time, self, and artistic creation thus live together in symbiotic association, and this reciprocal relationship forms the theme of Proust's writings. What the author argues for so convincingly is

its relevance for all characterization and its value as a guide to changing interpretations of value and experience according to the forms the relationship assumes in literature. Modern writing, from popular science-fiction to 'the time-school' attacked by Wyndham Lewis, reveals an obsession with time. Intellectual and social changes have fragmented the sense of time and hence of the self and art. The development of quantitative metric in modern science, the growth of economic systems based on time as a unit of production, the failure of teleological systems of history, the break-up of the family—such processes have combined to isolate the self intellectually and emotionally in the present moment, while a sense of existing in a transitional era deprives that presentness of significance. Above all, the steady decline of religious faith has removed the most satisfying of all responses to the death-direction of time. In the light of such arguments, the author examines the dissolution of the ego in the stream-of-consciousness novel, the displaced, anonymous man as in Kafka, the isolated hero as in Hemingway, Fitzgerald, and Camus, the return to mythical subjects or patterns as in Joyce, Mann, and Gide, and the nostalgic yearning for a lost unity and a broken continuity as in Faulkner, Galsworthy, Proust, and Mann. He has surprisingly passed over the central theme of O'Neill—that of 'belonging'; the denial of identity in Pirandello; and the split and mirror characters of the expressionist dramatists. One could have wished too for some consideration of the temporal implications in the structural and semantic experiments of Joyce and Gertrude Stein.

There is an excellent section on literary attempts to escape the temporal frustrations of this age. The mystic and the existentialist claim to transcend the limitations of time, the one through the denial, the other through the acceptance of their existence. Yet others seek to replace the loss of personal identity by a generic, human identity in the wider perspectives provided by the cyclical systems of history. Many go farther and find comfort in identification with mankind in general by way of the archetypal patterns to which the Viconian *ricorsi* can be made to conform. The conclusion of the book is that in the attitude to time lies the explanation of the antinomy between two types of philosophy: the scientific, which tries to explicate the 'thing-in-itself', and the non-scientific, or literary, philosophy, which tries to evaluate human experience. Neither is amenable to the discipline of the other, but each has its own validity. Their polarity corresponds to the dichotomy of modern life. Till the time comes when they can be resolved, it is the non-scientific philosophy which, like art and literature, can perhaps contribute most satisfyingly to human needs and values.

A. A. MENDILOW

Meditative-Polemic *Should* in Modern English *That*-Clauses. By FRANK BEHRE. Pp. 183 (Gothenburg Studies in English 4). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1955. Kr. 15.

Detailed descriptions of the finer points of English syntax and style, and explanations of the mental processes that govern their use, are still far from

adequate. The native speaker will very often be unaware of their existence, or, if faced with two slightly differing alternatives for expressing the same notion, he will tend to pronounce them equivalent, and the difference irrelevant. The continental teacher of English, however, may quite justifiably demand to know which expression is 'right' in which context, and it is this question—combined no doubt with the previous researches on the English subjunctive for which Professor Behre is well known—that has led to the searching inquiry he now presents. His main purpose is to determine the exact function and meaning of *should* in certain types of *that*-clause which would admit of a simple indicative in the same context: an example of one type is *I am surprised that he should have done it*, compared with the indicative in *I am surprised that he has done it*. He has collected his material from writings which might be expected to contain a high proportion of reflective or speculative passages (novels, essays), or of expressions of personal opinion (works of history and literary criticism). Of the seven main types of clause he distinguishes, six are introduced by various expressions of emotion (sorrow, surprise, joy, disbelief, mental acceptance) or by exclamations, as in *To think that he should have done this!* To these he adds a new type, not hitherto included in grammars, in which the accompanying expressions are much less stereotyped, e.g. *That he should have done this suggests* (or *indicates*, *proves*, &c.). . . . The examples in this group, he claims, reveal more of the way in which speakers choose between the two alternatives, since here the use of *should* or the indicative is less liable to have become fixed by habitual connexion with a set introductory phrase. From a study of the wider contexts in which all his examples occur, Dr. Behre concludes that *should* is used for 'meeting the resistance or easing the tension arising in the mind of the writer or expected to arise in the mind of the reader in the presence of a disturbing proposition', while the indicative states the proposition 'bluntly and provocatively'. His most important conclusion, however, concerns the distribution of *should*; he finds that it is more or less restricted to clauses which refer to a fact, proposition, or idea already stated or implied in the previous discussion, whereas the indicative more often introduces a new proposition.

The author has traced the historical development of this construction elsewhere, and is here concerned mainly with a description of the modern usage. In so far as he considers the 'commutation' of *should* with the indicative in one and the same context, and the 'distribution' of *should* in different contexts, descriptivists will have little cause for complaint. But those who favour the analysis of a complete linguistic function or notion may perhaps object that *should* and the indicative are not the only forms to be contrasted. For example, Dr. Behre does not point out that in Group IVB there is no indicative clause to contrast with the exclamation *That he should have done that!*, and yet there are others, like *Fancy his having done that!* and *For him to have done that!*, each with its place in the system; and, since the former contains a gerund and the latter an infinitive, their inclusion in the analysis might help to define the function of *should* more clearly.

As a label, 'Meditative-Polemic' has the advantage of being distinctive, but whether it is the most accurate or comprehensive that could be devised is less cer-

tain. For some cases, such as *I'm surprised you haven't thought fit to call in a doctor before*, Dr. Behre admits that the substitution of *should* 'softens' and 'implies a more delicate and tactful approach'. To these we may add many of the examples in Group VI, where the writer uses a *should*-clause to sum up his thoughts in the previous lines: as the clause contains a deduction or opinion of his own, he hesitates to impose it on the reader as a fact, and therefore tones it down to a more modest *should*-clause. Now, on this showing, we should need to extend the title to Meditative-Polemic-Hesitant-Modest-Polite, and so on until all possible contexts were catered for. One is tempted, therefore, to give fresh consideration to earlier views—especially those of Onions and Curme—that the indicative denotes a fact in its actuality, while *should* is used when the fact is viewed as a mere thought, idea, or abstraction. Dr. Behre evidently thinks this explanation inadequate, and it is true that it was based on a more mentalistic type of philosophy and psychology than is current today. Nevertheless, it can be brought up to date if the phrase 'viewed as an abstraction' is understood to include, wherever applicable, 'and intentionally expressed as such for the benefit of the hearer', and it would appear to be adequate for each of Dr. Behre's groups of *should*-clauses: in cases where a proposition has been explicitly stated, it is only natural that it should be referred to subsequently as an abstraction; and in other cases, where the proposition has been only implied, its expression in a toned-down, abstract form suffices to supply the exact degree of tact, modesty, 'unreality', &c., required in each context.

An argument[1] against this view that a *should*-clause expresses merely a thought or abstraction is that one can prefix *the fact* to most *should*-clauses, e.g. *the fact that he should have done this*. But this can be answered quite simply: Dr. Behre's own evidence shows that in all such cases *the fact* is 'anaphoric', i.e. it must refer to a proposition already stated or implied, whereas the *should*-clause that follows is merely explanatory, and therefore alludes to the proposition in more abstract form.

Regarding the function of *should*, therefore, the difference between Dr. Behre's view and those of his predecessors is one of formulation rather than substance. But this in no way lessens the value of his description of this usage; his work is a welcome contribution to the study of English mood-syntax.

M. L. SAMUELS

Studies in Communication contributed to the Communications Research Centre, University College, London. Pp. viii+182. London: Secker and Warburg, 1955. 21*s.* net.

This volume, which contains chapters by nine different scholars, is the first fruit of the activities of the Communications Research Centre which was founded in University College, London, in 1953. The central theme may be said to be the problem of the transference of information, whether among animals, humans, or machines. The situations where machines are involved have of course greatly

[1] Referred to by the author on pp. 33 and 141.

increased in number and complexity in recent years, and this furnishes the main (though by no means the only) impetus for the present kind of study. The use of machines may be confined to the process of transmission, but in other cases the machines may be the originators of information, or the recipients, or both. In the former situation they are often called upon to handle what we may call language in the conventional sense; in the latter, they must frequently employ some special language which may have to be devised for the purpose in hand. In either case it is not surprising that the accompanying technical problems lead back to fundamental questions connected with the structure of 'a language' and of 'language'. To begin with, a working knowledge of (or hypothesis about) the structure of the language under consideration is a necessary prelude to the attainment of as economical and elegant a 'realization' of it as possible, in which everything irrelevant is eliminated; this is of great and growing importance in numerous mechanized procedures. But 'structure', whether of the language of telephone conversations or of that by which a calculating machine is fed with information, has a non-linguistic side; it exists (or may from time to time have to be conceived and brought into existence) for ends which lie quite outside the process of communication altogether. Some of the resultant complexities are discussed by Professor A. J. Ayer in 'What is Communication?' (Chap. I). It is interesting that on the linguistic level itself, many of the problems run parallel to those which preoccupy descriptive linguists, and it is unfortunate that this fact receives little attention anywhere in the volume. Special questions of this sort (e.g. relating to syntax) crop up in the construction of translating machines, but little is said on this subject.

It is perhaps inevitable that *Studies in Communication* should be somewhat disconnected and fragmentary. It is also obvious that the general subject is only at certain points of direct interest to the student of English language or literature; nevertheless, the presence of only one article strictly devoted to English, that of Dr. Randolph Quirk on 'Colloquial English and Communication' (Chap. IX), obscures the extent of that interest. Yet, if only by analogy as it were, the literary critic will gather something of the possibilities from a reading of Professor R. Wittkower's 'Interpretation of Visual Symbols in the Arts' (Chap. VI), and the linguist will feel almost everywhere in the volume a sense of the connexion between his own familiar problems of linguistic analysis and those discussed from this other angle.

It is clear that English, because of its world importance, will receive more and more attention, in however general linguistic or logical or mathematical a setting, from those occupied with the theory and practice of communication. It is likely that this attention will have a considerable modifying influence upon some of the more conventional of current linguistic approaches, and that it will ultimately affect the approach to literature too. ANGUS MCINTOSH

SHORT NOTICES

Clarences Traum und Ermordung. By WOLFGANG CLEMEN. Pp. 46 (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse). München: Verlag Akademie, 1955. DM. 4.50.

Taking Clarence's dream as the poetical centre and climax of *Richard III*, Professor Clemen examines Clarence's 'epic narrative', and the scene in which it is found, with most revealing results. On the symbolical level he agrees with earlier commentators that Clarence's forebodings about drowning are meant as dramatic irony, anticipating his imminent death; the vision of the sea-bottom as a huge grave having the same function, while the confusion of precious stones and skeletons indicates a reversal of values, even jewels being worthless when ownerless (pp. 13–14). Shakespeare's other ways of integrating his scenes are then explored: the technique of anticipation and recollection (p. 19), the use of dreams, the dramatization of murder, the variations of style, and so on. Through its interlocking complexities this scene is therefore shown to rise above Shakespeare's immature early writing, since, despite the absence of the hero, the basic themes of the play are significantly developed.

In its 'intensive analysis' of the single speech and its context *Clarences Traum* resembles Dr. Clemen's *Die Tragödie vor Shakespeare* (1955), and will help to give shape to a new criticism from which much may be expected. E. A. J. HONIGMANN

Language and Poetry in Shakespeare's Early Plays. By GLADYS D. WILLCOCK. From the Proceedings of the British Academy XL, pp. 103–17. London: Cumberlege, for the Academy, 1955. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Professor Willcock's British Academy Lecture is concerned with an aspect of the theme she has made peculiarly her own, Shakespeare's creative use of rhetoric. She here confines her attention to the early plays. She stresses the fact which is sometimes forgotten, that 'in suitable contexts, the plain, direct, sharp, and pregnant might appear to Elizabethan listeners to be as successfully "artificial", that is, rhetorically effective, as the rotund and elaborate'. She admits that the dramatists went to 'pretty staggering' lengths in their use of amplification, and in this connexion she has an amusing analysis of a speech by Queen Margaret in *3 Henry VI*. She rightly distinguishes between the Senecan and Shakespearian treatment of violence, though it is misleading to suggest that Shakespeare was *prone* to use the word 'gobbets' in such contexts. The word is used only twice, and neither passage is indisputably Shakespearian.

In conclusion Miss Willcock addresses herself to the question whether Shakespeare's early style was a book-language rather than a stage-language. She shows that 'we cannot judge Elizabethan aural reception by our own', that they did not distinguish so much between the written and the spoken word, and that Shakespeare, as an actor, must have known what was speakable in the theatre and what was not. KENNETH MUIR

The Problem of John Ford. By H. J. OLIVER. Pp. viii+146. Melbourne: University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. 25*s.* net.

Mr. Oliver has had bad luck in that his book presumably went to press before M. Davril's work on Ford was published and appeared some months before Professor G. E. Bentley's latest volumes. His chapter on the plays written in collaboration is careful and

judicious; in this respect, he holds the balance between what is known and what can only be guessed better than Miss Sargeaunt and is less open to suggestion than M. Davril. It is interesting to find that his conclusions about these plays generally agree with Mr. Bentley's, but he holds with Mr. Lucas and Miss Sargeaunt that Ford had a hand in *The Fair Maid of the Inn*. A chapter or half-chapter is devoted to each of the eight independently written plays. Mr. Oliver usually summarizes plot, discusses relations between underplot and main plot, and analyses character and theme in a shrewd and temperate way. He thinks that '*Tis Pity* is the best of the plays, and his chapter on it is the best in his book; it emerges clearly both from this study and from what he says about *The Broken Heart* that Ford was not attacking conventional morality after the fashion of the problem-play dramatist as critics such as S. P. Sherman and Professor Sensabaugh have maintained. Here his findings accord with M. Davril's and help to restore a more balanced view. Mr. Oliver's book does not perhaps send us back to Ford with renewed zest: for my taste, he is a trifle mild and unadventurous in method, and I feel the lack of any discussion of the influence of Ford's Hellenic and Italianate settings on his plays, and of any very exacting analysis of his dramatic speech or his calculated theatrical effects. But while his book does not inspire, it will never mislead, and he does clearly show where Ford's place as a dramatist is: one who often looked back to Shakespeare over the heads of such as Massinger and Fletcher, but who in his best work was also searching for a new way in which to exercise his gift for 'dissecting the emotion of a character under stress'. If a plain and easy introduction to Ford is required, this book supplies it.

PETER URE

Milton and the Angels. By ROBERT H. WEST. Pp. x+237. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1955. $4.50.

The first half of Dr. West's book contains a barely readable 'digest' of 'Christian angelology as it helped to shape men's ideas in seventeenth-century England' (p. 1); the second is an unexpectedly interesting discussion of Milton's treatment of the angels in *Paradise Lost*. Dr. West has investigated theories of the angelic nature and functions with wonderful thoroughness, and he has taken much further the study of Milton's relation to the tradition, indicated by A. W. Verity in 1910 and given a new direction by Denis Saurat in 1925. His book will be useful as a work of reference, and also has its fascination as a collection of occult rubbish.

It is a pity that the critical half of the book should be placed as it is: the impression is given that Milton's angels somehow emerged from the previous welter, whereas it becomes clear from the critical analysis that he merely picked out what elements he fancied, and created and manipulated his own angels with personal freedom. There are only four strictly 'angelological' passages in *Paradise Lost*, and two of these are Milton's own. The two passages deriving from Michael Psellus (*P.L.* i. 423–31 and vi. 344–52) provide the 'scientific' basis for the War in Heaven, Pandaemonium, the appearances and disguises of Satan and the other spirits. Milton's own contributions are those on human and angelic nutriment (v. 469–503) and the loves of the angels (viii. 615–29), both of which are somewhat startling and might seem gratuitous: they can only be understood as expressions of Milton's conviction that things in Heaven and Earth are not so different as most theology has assumed. Dr. West's presentation of these and other relevant passages is lucid and sensible, if a little long-winded; it is therefore surprising to find him forcing a partial interpretation on the passages relating to the 'Sons of God' (pp. 129–30), and discovering a non-existent difficulty in that on the functions of the angels in relation to the planets and the stars (p. 160).

The 'physical' theories underlying Milton's treatment of the angels were seized on by Dr. Johnson and by A. J. A. Waldock as a serious weakness in the poem; one of the results of Dr. West's study is to show that such criticism is beside the mark, for Milton has skilfully made use of elements from earlier theory without committing himself to any but a

poetic consistency. *Paradise Lost* in fact dealt a death-blow to such speculations as those of Robert Fludd and Henry More: if angels could be as thoroughly 'poeticized' as they are in Milton's universe, it must soon have been plain that they could no longer provide the material for scientific or metaphysical conjecture. F. T. PRINCE

The Edinburgh Review and Romantic Poetry (1802–29). By THOMAS CRAWFORD. Pp. 42 (U. C. Bulletin 47, English Series 8). Auckland: University College, 1955. 4*s*. net.

Mr. Crawford argues that the *Edinburgh* did not disapprove on principle of contemporary poetry. Its aesthetic as represented by Hallam and Jeffrey, especially Jeffrey, was fairly advanced. The second generation of Romantics did not come off at all badly, and 1816 is something of a turning-point. The *Quarterly* and *Blackwood's* were the savagers. The *Edinburgh's* practice was to point out faults as well as merits, which meant a 'see-saw' between two opinions.

Mr. Crawford's case is well put and solidly documented. He does not fully explain the imaginative limitations which prevented Jeffrey's proper appreciation of the best poetry of Wordsworth and Coleridge. Nor, on the other hand, is his argument as new as he seems to think. To anyone familiar with Professor Nichol Smith's introduction to *Jeffrey's Literary Criticism* (Oxford, 1910) Mr. Crawford is almost slaying the slain. 'Jeffrey was a convinced modern', wrote Mr. Nichol Smith. 'He was an intellectualist. This is the real explanation of his criticism.' 'He shared the new enthusiasm for the Elizabethans and helped to promote it . . . in his old age [he] reads idle snatches of Shakespeare, and Fletcher, and Keats, and Shelley.' It is odd that Mr. Crawford does not mention Mr. Nichol Smith.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

Das persönliche Menschenbild Matthew Arnolds in der dichterischen Gestaltung. By GERHARD MÜLLER-SCHWEFE. Pp. 292. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1955. DM. 31.

'I cannot set to read it like French, though I work at it with fury. They are lumbering old carthorses, the Germans, and that is the truth.' How Arnold would view this habilitationschrift for the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Tübingen it is hard to say. It is an exhaustive and exhausting analysis of his use of poetic language. Dr. Müller-Schwefe examines Arnold's use of italics, his foreign words, and, more rewardingly, his images. Painstaking word counts are designed to explore Arnold's own suggestion that 'the ethical influence of style in language—its close relations, so often pointed out, with character, are most important'.

Dr. Müller-Schwefe tries in this formidably well-documented linguistic analysis to discover what Arnold betrays (rather than offers) about himself. He gets away in a good ten pages to a discussion on Arnold's use of 'calm' which is brought up short on p. 73 with the realization that Arnold has not played according to the rule, and uses 'calm' in senses other than he should. The following six on his use of the word 'self' should interest English Arnoldians, and from the point of view of this reviewer at least, might have repaid a chapter to itself.

The desire to concentrate on Arnold's poetry inevitably tempts the author to cross the boundary from linguistic analysis to aesthetics, and it is here that Dr. Müller-Schwefe is in his element whilst his readers will be out of theirs. There is a pleasing interpretation of Heine's influence, and a good bibliography which supplements those of Motter and Mainwaring. 'The Prophet of European Unity'—as *The Times Literary Supplement* called Arnold in April 1938—would find the preoccupation with words in this study particularly

frustrating and would no doubt repeat, with added emphasis, the words from *Poor Matthias* (1882):

> Us unable to divine
>
> . . . . .
>
> Or o'erpass the severing sea
> Set between ourselves and thee.

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

Studies in Memory of John Jay Parry. By members of the English Department, University of Illinois. Pp. viii+224. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955.

In this memorial volume (reprinted from *J.E.G.P.*, liv, 1955) M. R. Stern approaches *The Pearl* through 'four-sense' exegesis and medieval lapidary symbolism and expounds a manifold allegory of pride, purification, and grace. Such interpretations (like the *Letter to Can Grande*) inevitably seem lean beside the poem's full effect, but Stern does not claim exhaustiveness and his comments on structure do sharpen appreciation. The contrast between high-flown and low love-talk in the Miller's and Reeve's Tales (repeating the basic contrast of Group A as a whole) is shown by G. Stillwell to be a well-marked device of the OF. *fabliaux*. M. T. Herrick's characterization of dramas styled 'New' by the sixteenth century, though based on continental and neo-Latin examples, is useful: the use in comedy and tragedy alike of history and fiction, of happy endings, of romantic love, and of exalted and lowly persons; and modification of the classical hierarchy of styles. R. M. Smith convincingly relates the two Red Crosses of Spenser's Knight to a Limerick proclamation by Sir William Pelham (? = Sir Sergius, *F.Q.*, v. xi) on 6 November 1579 and to a military usage at least two centuries older. G. B. Evans assigns the Dering conflation of *1* and *2 Henry IV* to Sir Edward Dering himself, some time after 1613. (He assumes its derivation from Q5; contrast H. Craig, *P.Q.*, xxxv (1956), 218–19.)

In view of recent attention (e.g. J. Whaler, F. T. Prince) to effects like counterpoint in Milton's verse it is worth pondering H. Fletcher's suggestion that the practice of versifying in dead languages by some rigid metrical system must inevitably have made the poet conscious of double rhythm in words. Pope's 'horticultural romanticism' is shown by A. L. Altenbernd to be part of his neo-classicism in poetry and to stem from the traditional conception of Art's subordination to Nature (*P.L.*, iv, Marvell's *Garden*, ix, &c.); and R. W. Rogers prints and establishes the chronology (1715–38) of the five versions of *The Universal Prayer*. R. L. Schneider in his interesting essay on the *Immortality Ode* finds no comfort in the poem—the Christian hope was still a few years off—only bleak loss and severance, a dualistic universe; but he overlooks the way in which with Wordsworth from the beginning, and here too, blessed perceptions and occasions of ecstatic insight pass into something like symbols (cf. F. M. Marsh's *Wordsworth's Imagery*, and E. Morgan in *Essays in Criticism*, v (1955), 341–53).

Other essays discuss Sidney's attacks on astrology (M. S. Goldman); Marlowe's acquaintance with Musaeus in Greek (T. W. Baldwin); Giles Fletcher's Anglicanism (A. Holaday); Mrs. Veal's apparition in 1705 (A. W. Secord—cf. *R.E.S.*, N.S. vi (1955), 259–63); Johnson's first knowledge of Bennet Langton (C. N. Fifer); Masonic imagery in *Jubilate Agno* and other poems by Smart (A. Sherbo); the debt of *Nigger of the Narcissus* to Maupassant's *Pierre et Jean* (G. J. Worth); and there is a valuable comparison by C. H. Shattuck of the little-known 1893 edition of *Widowers' Houses* with the rewritten 1898 version. One of the most suggestive essays (E. H. Davidson) traces the fossilized 'pathetic fallacy' criticized by Ruskin to an older view of man and world as one, associates this view with the specifically seventeenth-century Puritan consciousness of God's hand in creation, and finds both modes in the work of Hawthorne. J. C. BRYCE

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ANGLIA
Band 74, Heft 3, 1956
The Newberry Library Manuscript of the *Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers* (C. F. Bühler), 281–91.
Humanismus und Allegorie in Spensers Sonetten (D. Bludau), 292–332.
Gerard Manley Hopkins: Zu einer deutschen Neuerscheinung (T. Spira), 333–44.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY
Vol. xxxix, No. 2, March 1957
The Work of a Late 15th-century English Scribe, William Ebesham (A. I. Doyle), 298–325.
Carlyle's Portraits of his Contemporaries (C. R. Sanders), 521–57.

ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. xxxviii, No. 2, April 1957
Samuel Daniel's Sense of the Past (W. Blissett), 49–63.
Unconscious 'Borrowing' and the Problem of Inspiration (A. A. Prins), 64–71.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM
Vol. vii, No. 1, January 1957
Banquo and Edgar: Character or Function? (L. Kirschbaum), 1–21.
Was Hobbes an Ogre? (V. de S. Pinto), 22–27.
The Disputed Lines in *The Fall of Hyperion* (B. Wicker), 28–41.
The Art of the Enemy [Charles Williams] (R. Conquest), 42–55.
L. C. Knights and Restoration Comedy (F. W. Bateson), 56–67.

Vol. vii, No. 2, April 1957
Literature and Language (R. A. Sayce) 119–33.
Reviewing in the *London Magazine* (M. Roberts), 144–62.
E. L. Voynich: A Forgotten English Novelist (A. Kettle), 163–74.
Intention (T. M. Gang), 175–86.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES
X^e Année, No. 1, janvier–mars 1957
Beowulf and the Snares of Literary Criticism (A. Bonjour), 30–36.
L'Expression dans *Our Mutual Friend*: Manière ou Maniérisme? (S. Monod), 37–48.

LEUVENSE BIJDRAGEN
xlvi^e Jaarg., Afl. 1–2, 1956–7
De Gotische woordenschat vergeleken met die van het Noord- en Westgermaans (J. de Vries), 5–39.
Zur Herkunft des engl. *Gun* (F. M. Swensen), 40–52.

LIBRARY CHRONICLE OF UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
Vol. vi, No. 1, Spring 1957
The Letters of George Meredith (C. L. Cline), 30–32.
The W. B. Yeats Collection at Texas (H. Adams), 33–38.

MEDIUM ÆVUM
Vol. xxv, No. 3, 1957
John Ridewall's Commentary on *De Civitate Dei* (B. Smalley), 140–53.
The *Romance of Horn* and *King Horn* (M. K. Pope), 164–7.
The Parlement of Foules and Lionel of Clarence (E. Seaton), 168–74.
The Dolorous Stroke (E. Vinaver), 175–80.
Onomastic Riddles in Malory's *Book of Arthur and his Knights* (R. S. Loomis), 181–90.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES
Vol. lxxii, No. 1, January 1957
'Romigan ures rices': A Reconsideration of *Genesis B*, l. 360 (A. Renoir), 1–4.
The Verses in Lambeth MS. 265 (C. F. Bühler), 4–6.
The Hous of Fame and the House of the Musicians (G. G. Williams), 6–9.
Spenser and *The Historie of Cambria* (R. B. Gottfried), 9–13.
Another Possible Analogue for Swift's *Tale of a Tub* (J. M. Stedmond), 13–18.
Symbolic Meaning in Blake's 'Nine Years' (G. M. Harper), 18–19.
Ezra Pound's Appraisal of Whitman (C. B. Willard), 19–26.
The Journey Motif in Whitman and Tennyson (R. H. Woodward), 26–27.
Time and the Unnamed Article in *The Ambassadors* (R. W. Stallman), 27–32.
Nostromo and 'The Snows of Kilimanjaro' (W. B. Bache), 32–34.
A Skaldic Note: 'I stall drepinn' (C. Wood), 34–36.
Syncope of Vowel *a* in the *at*-Suffix of the Past Participle in the *e*-Class of Old Norse Weak Verbs (A. M. Sturtevant), 36–38.
The Wandering Jew and *The Travels and Adventures of James Massey* (S. G. Andrews), 39–41.

Vol. lxxii, No. 2, February 1957
The Literary Background of Lydgate's *Legend of Dan Joos* (B. Boyd), 81–87.
The Wife of Bath and the Shipman (W. W. Lawrence), 87–88.
The Age of Troilus (J. M. Steadman), 89–90.
'. . . Who Only Stand and Wait' (J. L. Jackson and W. E. Weese), 91–93.

Two Problems in Donne's 'Farewell to Love' (K. T. Emerson), 93–95.
Pope and Miss Betty Marriot (R. N. Maud), 96–97.
Conrad: A Nautical Image (R. O. Evans), 98–99.
Masefield's *Dauber* (F. B. Drew), 99–101.
Emily Dickinson's Boanerges and Thoreau's Atropos (N. Wright), 101–3.
Henry James's First Short Story (R. L. Gale), 103–7.
Some Gothic Inflexional Endings (J. W. Marchand), 107–10.

Vol. lxxii, No. 3, March 1957
Structure in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (D. B. J. Randall), 161–3.
Chaucer's Method of Composition (C. A. Owen, Jr.), 164–5.
The Date of *Mandeville's Travels* (J. D. Thomas), 165–9.
More and Lucian (J. Crossett), 169–70.
The Title of Nash's *Pierce Penniless* (N. K. Snortum), 170–3.
The Prosody of Milton's *Epitaph, L'Allegro*, and *Il Penseroso* (M. F. Moloney), 174–8.
Steele, The Junto and *The Tatler* No. 4 (C. Winton), 178–82.
A James 'Gift' to Edith Wharton (M. Bell), 182–5.
The Reflection of Poe in Conrad Aiken's 'Strange Moonlight' (S. L. Gross), 185–9.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY
Vol. xviii, No. 1, March 1957
Hawaiian Echoes in Melville's *Mardi* (A. G. Day), 3–8.
Symbolic Structure in *Modern Love* (N. Friedman), 9–26.
Language and Structure in Poetic Drama (H. Blau), 27–34.
An Explication of Lovelace's *The Grasshopper* (D. C. Allen), 35–43.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW
Vol. lii, No. 2, April 1957
The Application of Textual Theory to Hamlet's Dying Words (W. M. T. Nowottny), 161–7.
Ben Jonson's *To Sir William Sidney, on his Birthday* (L. C. John), 168–76.
Four Notes on *Macbeth* (E. Schanzer) 223–7.
Two Notes on the Poems of Richard Lovelace (C. F. Williamson), 227–9.

NEOPHILOLOGUS
41ste Jaarg., Afl. 2, 1 April 1957
The Insubstantial Pageant [Medieval Drama] (J. Swart), 127–41.
Junius' Stay in Friesland (B. J. Timmer), 141–4.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN.
Vol. lvii, Nr. 7–8, Dezember 1956
Zu den irisch-englischen Beziehungen (E. Lewy), 315–18.
Henry James and Julio Reuter (N. E. Enkvist), 318–24.

NOTES AND QUERIES
Vol. iv, N.S. No. 2, February 1957
Senois: a colour name? 48–49.
Inns of Court nomenclature, 49.
Middleton and *The Puritan*, 50–51.
Interpretation [*Hamlet*, IV. iv. 53, *Othello*, v. ii. 198], 51.
'Do or die' in *Measure for Measure*, 52.
The actor-reporter, 52–53.
Notes on Webster's tragedies, 53–55.
Massinger and three others, 55–56.
Dryden on Donne and Cowley, 56–59.
Explication of Donne's *The Flea*, 60–61.
T. Carew's early reputation, 61–62.
'The Case of William Jaggard', 62–63.
'Forlorn' in *Cymbeline* and *1 Henry VI*, 64.
Marlowe, Massinger, and Webster, 64–65.
The vocabulary of Marston (x), 65–66.
Dryden and Fletcher, 66–68.
Manningham and Marston, 69.
On Satan's Hair, 69–70.
Brome's *Horace*, 70–71.
Dr. Arne and a burlesque ode, 71–73.
'Scarlet' and 'Pink', 73–74.
A missing Hailes-Walpole letter, 75–76.
Proposals of marriage in *Pamela*, 76.
Lydia Languish's library, 76.
Harleian MS. 6395, 77–79.
Hamlet, I. iii. 74, 84.
'Spiced conscience' [*Canterbury Tales*, Prol. 526 *et al.*], 84.

Vol. iv, N.S. No. 3, March 1957
Sir F. Drake in contemporary verse, 99–101.
The death of Marlowe, 101–3.
A Wyatt MS., 103–4.
A 17th-century fiction reprint, 104.
The Marshall Sisters and Anne Quin, 104–6.
Francis Kirkman's *The Wits*, 106–8.
Mammon and Mulciber, 112–13.
Milton and 18th-century taste, 113–14.
Lucy North, 114–17.
The *Life of Richard Nash*, 120–1.
Attacks on the *Critical Review*, 121.
Blake, Priestley, and the Gnostics, 122.
An exoneration of Byron, 122–3.
An American *Pickwick*, 123–4.
Dyce on Charles Lamb, 124–5.
The Oxford Debate (1860), 126–8.
Housman and Pindar, 128–9.
Wilhelm Raabe, 130–2.
Morris's early poetry, 132–3.

Vol. iv, N.S. No. 4, April 1957

Beowulf, 2570b–2575a, 140.
Marvell's Grasshoppers, 142.
Shylock and King Lear, 142–3.
Schoole of Night, 143.
The Shakespeare First Folio, 143–4.
Sir John Hayward, 144–5.
Guevara in Webster's common-place book, 145–6.
Donne and Jonson, 146–7.
Manningham and Marston, 147.
Hamlet, I. iii. 74, 148.
Othello and *Irene*, 148.
Drummond of Hawthornden, 148–50.
Clarendon and Hobbes, 150.
A Stuart tourist in Rome, 150–1.
The Eve of St. Agnes and *A Pair of Blue Eyes*, 153.
Johnson quotes Addison, 154.
'Ghost' books in Cambridge Bibliography, 154–5.
Tony Weller's trade, 155–9.
Nashe and Mandeville, 159–60.
Crux in *Arden of Feversham*, 160–1.
Jonson's *Discoveries*, 162–3.
Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, 163–4.
Swift and *A Vindication of the Clergy*, 164–7.
Accounts of Constable of Castile on embassy to England in 1604, 167–70.
Marvell's sources, 170–3.
O.E.D. quotation for 'receptive', 178.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxvi, No. 1, January 1957

The Crisis of *Paradise Lost* Reconsidered (H. V. S. Ogden), 1–19.
Joyce and Aquinas: The Theory of Aesthetics (M. Beebe), 20–35.
The Evolution of Joyce's *Anna Livia Plurabelle* (W. Litz), 36–48.
The Image of Pluto and Proserpine in the *Merchant's Tale* (M. J. Donovan), 49–60.
The Antique Gentility of Hester Prynne (E. Stone), 90–96.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxxii, No. 1, March 1957

Distance and Predestination in Troilus and Criseyde (M. W. Bloomfield), 14–26.
Montaigne on the Dignity of Man (A. C. Keller), 43–54.
Machiavelli and Fielding's *Jonathan Wild* (B. Shea), 55–73.
Keats's Ideal in the *Ode on a Grecian Urn* (J. D. Wigod), 113–21.
De Quincey Revises his *Confessions* (I. Jack), 122–46.
George Eliot and the Climate of Realism (W. J. Hyde), 147–64.
Emily Dickinson's Poetic Vocabulary (W. Howard), 225–48.
Whitman's *Calamus*: 'The Leaf and the Root (J. E. Miller, Jr.), 249–71.
Here was a Caesar: Shaw's Comedy Today (G. W. Couchman), 272–85.
The Modality of the Audible in Joyce's *Ulysses* (J. E. Duncan), 286–95.
An analysis of *The Windhover* (W. H. Matchett), 310–11.

RESEARCH STUDIES OF THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

Vol. xxv, No. 1, March 1957

The Relation of Cicero's Rhetoric to Augustine (L. D. McNew), 5–13.
Some Scribal Errors in the English Arthuriana (R. W. Ackerman), 14–23.
Poetic Justice: The Dilemma of the Early Creators of Sentimental Tragedy (L. W. Magill), 24–32.
The Textual History of Murphy's *Gray's Inn Journal* (R. B. Botting), 33–48.
Wordsworth's Spiritual Autobiography (F. M. Towne), 57–62.
Hy, Zy, Hine [Browning] (F. A. Dudley), 63–68.
Walt Whitman's *Open Road* (R. Slonim), 69–74.
The Real Thing [H. James] (W. F. Wright), 85–90.
Henry James's *The Art of Fiction* (B. R. McElderry, Jr.), 91–100.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxv, No. 2, Spring 1957

Yeats and the Clean Outline (D. Donoghue), 202–25.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO STUDIES

Series in Language and Literature No. 6, January 1957

The Voice of Shakespeare (G. F. Reynolds), 1–12.
The View from Cooper's Hill (R. Putney), 13–22.
The English Rejection of Young's *Night-Thoughts* (H. Pettit), 23–38.
Ruskin on the Moral Imagination in Architecture (B. Morris), 39–54.
Mark Twain: 'Moralist in Disguise' (P. J. Carter, Jr.), 65–78.
The Playwright as Producer: Sir Arthur Pinero (E. J. West), 79–102.
Mr. Eliot's 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' Reconsidered (E. P. Bollier), 103–18.

[*Continued from p. ii of cover*

Dunciad. A Study of its Meaning, by Aubrey L. Williams, 316; William Hogarth. *The Analysis of Beauty*, edited by Joseph Burke, 319; Tristram Shandy's World. Sterne's Philosophical Rhetoric, by John Traugott, 320; The Letters of Edward Gibbon, Volumes I–III, edited by J. E. Norton, 322; P. B. Shelley, by Elio Chinol, 323; Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity. 1811–1846, by Gordon N. Ray, 325; Whitman's Manuscripts; Leaves of Grass (1860), edited by Fredson Bowers, 326; Melville and the Comic Spirit, by Edward H. Rosenberry, 328; Mark Rutherford. A Biography of William Hale White, by Catherine Macdonald Maclean, 330; Rudyard Kipling. His Life and Work, by Charles Carrington, 332; D. H. Lawrence. A Basic Study of his Ideas, by Mary Freeman; D. H. Lawrence. Select Literary Criticism, edited by Anthony Beal, 334; Essays by Divers Hands, being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. New Series, Volume XXVII, edited by Sir George Rostrevor Hamilton, 336; Speculative Instruments, by I. A. Richards, 339; Elements of Poetry, by James R. Kreuzer, 340; Time in Literature, by Hans Meyerhoff, 342; Meditative-Polemic *Should* in Modern English *That*-Clauses, by Frank Behre, 343; Studies in Communication contributed to the Communications Research Centre, University College, London, 345; Short Notices, 347; Summary of Periodical Literature, 351.

THE DICKENSIAN

53rd YEAR OF PUBLICATION

Devoted to the study of Dickens. Published by the Dickens Fellowship in January, May, and September

12*s.* 6*d.* per annum, post free

Specimen copy on request

'This is a monument if you like; the continued prosperity of this periodical is a finer testimony to the glory and honour of its subject than any bronze or marble could be.' E. V. LUCAS

THE DICKENS HOUSE
48 Doughty Street, London, W.C. 1

HEFFER'S

A CAMBRIDGE BOOKSHOP THAT IS KNOWN IN ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD

●

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD
Petty Cury, Cambridge

Printed in Great Britain by Charles Batey at the University Press, Oxford